

By Mr. THORNBERRY:
H. R. 1514. A bill for the relief of Clint Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (by request):
H. R. 1515. A bill for the relief of Max Hermann Kellbar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:
H. R. 1516. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clementine De Ryck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:
H. R. 1517. A bill for the relief of Corp. Predrag Mitrovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:
H. R. 1518. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Sasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

11. By Mr. BUSH: Resolution of the Commissioners, Lycoming County, Pa., to amend existing Social Security Act so as to make the benefits of social security available to any and all political subdivisions desirous of adopting a plan for its officials and employees, whether or not such subdivisions have in effect a present existing pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

12. By Mr. HOWELL: Resolution of Cape May County Bar Association, adopted December 20, 1952, petitioning the Congress to amend title 28 of the United States Code, particularly sections 110 and 133 of said title, increasing the number of judges for the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey from six to seven, and providing that in said district, court shall be held at Atlantic City, Camden, Newark, and Trenton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

13. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Racine, Wis., in support of the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Almighty, at noontide the voice of our prayer rises to Thee. We come asking for strength that we may toil in these fields of time in the sense of the eternal. Only when our vision is cleansed and corrected by far horizons can we see the transient in the light of the everlasting. Like tillers of the soil who stand reverently with bowed heads, listening to the music of holy bells, so at the beginning of this day's deliberations we would pause to become spiritually aware of silvery notes from a pealing belfry no human eye can see, or ear hear.

Send us forth with serenity and calm to meet an agitated world with an unruffled kindness which is strength and an inner candor which is the courage of the soul. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Jour-

nal of the proceedings of Friday, January 9, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the Thirty-eighth Annual Report of the Committee covering the fiscal year 1952.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 13, 1953.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 78, Eighty-first Congress, I transmit herewith for the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission its final report.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 13, 1953.

NOTE: The report was transmitted to the House of Representatives.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 60)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a Report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operation from April 1, 1952, to September 30, 1952, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 13, 1953.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that company for the calendar year 1952, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of considering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts

"Whereas the National Government through the excessive use of its tax power has greatly encroached upon the tax-revenue sources of the several States; and

"Whereas the very existence of our dual system of government is dependent upon strong and economically sound State governments; and

"Whereas the continued preemption of available tax sources by the Federal Government will seriously impair the tax structure of the several States, thus tending to further centralize the Government on a national basis: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of Louisiana respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to levy and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration; Provided, That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon, or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 4. The limitations upon the rates of said taxes contained in sections 2 and 3 shall, however, be subject to the qualification that in the event of a war in which the United States is engaged creating a grave national emergency requiring such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of each House may for a period not exceeding 1 year increase beyond the limits above prescribed the maximum rate of any such tax upon income subsequently accruing or received or with respect to subsequent devolutions or transfers of property, with like power, while the

United States is actively engaged in such war, to repeat such action as often as such emergency may require.

"SEC. 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"SEC. 6. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3 laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect; be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

The memorial of Thomas O. Glenn, of Austin, Tex., remonstrating against the appointment of O. N. Bruck as postmaster at Austin, Tex. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by Paul M. Gallaher, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., relating to the seating of Senator LANGER as a Member of the Senate for the term beginning January 3, 1953; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the Pan Arcadian Federation of America, Chicago, Ill., favoring the return of the island of Cyprus to Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the PanArcadian Federation National Convention, Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation providing an additional quota of immigrants from Greece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Regina Gingold, of Coronado, Calif., praying for a redress of grievances (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Helen B. Werblin, of Somerville, N. J., relating to the sale of land to the Government for official business (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

The petition of Sara Lee Babcock, of Oxford, Ohio, relating to racial discrimination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Mrs. Nettie Brown, of Stanley, N. Y., relating to old-age pensions; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Mr. and Mrs. Albert E. Haas, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages over the radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of County and Prosecuting Attorneys, at Highland Park, Ill., favoring an increase in personnel of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of County and Prosecuting Attorneys, at Highland Park, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to intercept communications in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the council of the city of Alameda, Calif., relating to tem-

porary war housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Erna Lisette Hadra, past president, Santa Monica Bay Chapter, American Gold Star Mothers, Inc., Santa Monica, Calif., embodying a request for a resolution favoring an investigation by the Senate of the Memorial National Home Foundation, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The memorial of Doris Turgeon, a citizen of the United States, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FLOOD DAMAGE ON REDWOOD RIVER, MINN.—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF MARSHALL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Marshall, Minn., on December 15, 1952, citing flood damage to the city and calling upon the Congress to assist, in matters beyond the jurisdiction of the city, to improve the flow of the Redwood River.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the city of Marshall has suffered disastrous floods during the spring of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952, caused by waters of the Redwood River overflowing the river banks and flooding large areas of public and private property within the city causing damage to property and losses in excess of \$1,000,000; and

Whereas in the interest of promoting public health and safety, and in consideration of safeguarding the public property of the city, and the private property of residents within the city from future disastrous floods, it was deemed imperative to take immediate measures to control the waters of the Redwood River for the prevention of future floods within the city; and

Whereas the city of Marshall has already expended, since April 1952, the sum of \$16,000 for the construction of dikes, cleaning and dredging the river channel, and constructing diversionary channels, all of which have placed a severe burden upon the taxpayers and taxable property of the city; and

Whereas the full benefit of the flood-control measures taken by the city will not be realized unless and until the channel of the Redwood River lying downstream from the city is cleared of trees, debris, and other matter which causes ice-jamming retarding the flow of the river and resulting in a swelling of the river in the channel within the city limits; and

Whereas the city of Marshall has no right or jurisdiction to carry on the necessary clearing and snagging operations downstream and outside the city limits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Marshall, Minn., That an appeal be made to the Members of the Congress of the United States apprising them of the damages caused by floods to the city of Marshall and the nature and costs of measures taken by the city to control the flood waters of the Redwood River, a tributary of the Minnesota River; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to take such measures as are necessary and expedient to improve the flow of the Redwood River outside and

beyond the jurisdiction of the city of Marshall.

Passed and adopted by the common council of the city of Marshall, Minn., this 15th day of December 1952.

THE COMMON COUNCIL,
By O. T. BUSSARD,
Chairman of the Common Council.

Attest:

H. N. HARMON.

I hereby approve the foregoing resolution this 15th day of December 1952.

GEORGE ABRAHAMSEN,
Mayor.

RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that several resolutions, adopted by the Minnesota State Federation of Labor, at its seventieth convention held on October 6 through 8, 1952, in Minneapolis, Minn., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 11

Introduced by Delegate Stewart, etc., representing Grain Millers Union No. 1, Minneapolis.

"Whereas the St. Lawrence waterway bill has been repeatedly defeated through the influence of large eastern interests; and

"Whereas such an outlet to the sea would be a boon to the industry of Minnesota and the great Middle West; and

"Whereas the existing railroad freight rates give Minnesota a disadvantage to that of the rest of the Nation, and these conditions are slowly strangling industry in Minnesota: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the convention go on record to petition Congress to pass the St. Lawrence waterway bill."

The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 13

Introduced by Delegate Stewart representing Grain Millers Union No. 1, Minneapolis.

"Whereas whole grain is being exported to foreign countries without being milled in the United States of America; and

"Whereas the milling industry is now operating at 75 percent of total capacity; and

"Whereas previously the law required at least 25 percent of all wheat exported had to be milled in the United States of America, thereby creating additional work for members of our union: Therefore be it

"Resolved, The convention go on record that the law be reinstated as it previously existed; that 25 percent of all exported grain be milled in the United States of America."

The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 18

Introduced by Delegate Tschirley Noreen representing Post Office Clerks Union No. 65, St. Paul.

"Whereas many substitutes in the post office are required to work as many as 14 hours per day and as much as 80 hours per week without receiving overtime; and

"Whereas apparently the only way to eliminate the use of substitutes is to make them too expensive to hire thereby creating a situation whereby all employees will eventually become regular employees; and

"Whereas substitutes are not paid for time spent on military leave as in the case of regular classified employees; and

"Whereas the present method of granting annual and sick leave according to the number of hours worked each pay day by hourly employees deprives these employees of full credit on annual and sick leave in many cases: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor in State convention assembled in Minneapolis August 6, 1952, support and instruct their national leaders to seek legislation in the next session of Congress that will:

"1. Grant overtime to all hourly paid employees in the postal service for all time worked in excess of 8 hours per day or 40 hours per week.

"2. Guarantee a minimum of 2 hours work to all hourly paid employees each time they are ordered to report for duty.

"3. Make it mandatory that a maximum of 1 hourly paid employee for every six regular classified employees be established.

"4. Extend to all hourly paid employees the benefits of paid military leave on a 40-hour week basis the same as regular employees.

"5. Credit to all hourly paid employees annual and sick leave on a monthly basis instead of the present method of requiring a certain number of hours to be worked in order to obtain full benefits."

The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 19

Introduced by Delegate Bergman representing State Employees Council Union No. 6.

"Whereas the objectives of the organized State employees affiliated with the Minnesota State Federation of Labor are:

"(a) To advance the economic, social and general welfare of public employees.

"(b) To foster and promote a liberal and progressive public attitude toward public administration.

"(c) To extend and uphold the principle of merit and fitness in public employment."

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 30

Introduced by delegates representing Radio Broadcast Technicians, Union No. 1216, Twin Cities.

"Whereas Radio Station KSTP and its owner and operator, Stanley Hubbard, have unfairly locked out members of the A. F. of L.; and

"Whereas the radio station has consistently refused to negotiate an agreement between the station and locked out employees: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor, in the seventieth annual convention assembled, take the necessary action which would result in refusal of each and every commercial advertiser utilizing the broadcasting facilities of radio station KSTP of St. Paul, Minn.; and be it further

"Resolved, That any increase in power and renewal of license by the Federal Communications Commission be denied to KSTP; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Federation circularize the affiliated unions requesting that they send two communications to the Federal Communications Commission protesting renewal of the license of KSTP for increased power on the basis of the antilabor record of the station. Also that the station is not being conducted in the public interest. That copies of this resolution be sent to all Senators and Congressmen from Minnesota and released to the press."

The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 32

Introduced by Delegates representing Retail Clerks Union No. 1116, Duluth.

"Whereas the American Federation of Labor went on record in favor of H. R. 6785; and

"Whereas, this bill provides that the interstate shipments of goods produced on premises leased from a State or municipality be prohibited; and

"Whereas if this bill was passed in its present form many of our members would be out of work: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor here assembled go on record requesting changes in the law so as to exclude projects set up by the Minnesota Iron Range Resources Rehabilitation Commission and projects of a similar nature."

The committee recommended that paragraph 4 be amended to read as follows:

"Resolved, That if any Federal legislation is introduced in the future, similar H. R. 6785, that the Minnesota State Federation of Labor go on record as taking the position that such legislation be confined to prison work and similar work performed in public institutions in competition with private industry and when so amended recommend concurrence in the resolution. The report of the Committee was adopted."

The committee reported that resolution No. 33 was withdrawn by its authors.

Resolution 41

Introduced by delegates representing Post Office Clerks Union No. 125, Minneapolis.

"Whereas despite the repeal of the gag laws ostensibly giving postal employees union recognition; and

"Whereas despite the tremendous growth and advances made by organized labor; and

"Whereas the failure to carry on relations with employee organizations has resulted in a lowering of morale, along with an increasing large labor turnover; and

"Whereas employee group representatives believe themselves to be intelligent and realistic, capable of meeting with administrative officials on an equal basis regarding postal policies; and on a national as well as a local level; and

"Whereas the Rhodes-Withrow bill H. R. 571, referred to as the "Union Recognition Bill" as now reported in the Congress of the United States is without its two most important provisions, namely: punitive redress against postmasters and supervisors not enforcing its provisions and secondly, recognition of the majority employee organization as bargaining agent; and

"Whereas these two provisions provide the fundamental strength and potential success of any union recognition law enacted and without which no union recognition can actually be accomplished or assured: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor assembled in convention use every possible means to gain support and effect eventual enactment of Union Recognition legislation by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor take a strong stand on behalf of the principles 'punitive redress and majority recognition' to be included in any union recognition law enacted."

The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 42

Introduced by Delegates representing Post Office Union No. 125, Minneapolis.

"Whereas the right of the citizen to vote, freely express his opinion on public ques-

tions, whether it be in private conversation or in public discussion, and to join with his fellow citizens in organizing for political purposes, must be regarded as a right never to be abridged, if we accept the theory that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed; and

"Whereas by means of the abridgment of the right of the citizens to fully exercise his citizenship, small but powerful economics groups have succeeded in many instances in controlling elections; and

"Whereas because of legislation such as the Hatch Act, the Taft-Hartley Act, certain sections of the United States Criminal Code, as well as the Civil Service Regulations, Government employees for many years have been subjected to a constant and increasing encroachment upon their rights as American citizens by the enactment of laws which have restricted their rights to participate in political activities vital to their interests; and

"Whereas existing laws deny certain constitutional rights to an ever increasing number of American citizens being veterans of the Armed Forces that risked their lives to preserve those constitutional rights: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor favors the restoration to all Government employees (not in a supervisory capacity) of full citizenship rights, including the right to vote, the right of free speech on public questions, and the right to join with their fellow citizens in organizing for political purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That no individual in his administrative capacity shall be permitted to use his position to exert pressure to influence the political views of others with whom he may have official contact, and be it further

"Resolved, That this convention urge the repeal of the Hatch Act and other various restrictions placed upon political activities of the Federal employees with adequate legislative safeguards being retained which will protect employees from administrators or others in a position to determine their tenure, or welfare, or advancement in their employment."

The committee recommended that the resolution be amended in the first resolve to read as follows:

"Resolved, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor favors the restoration to all Government employees of full citizenship rights, including the right to vote, the right of free speech on public questions and the right to join with their fellow citizens in organizing for political purposes, and when so amended, recommends concurrence in the resolution."

The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 48

Introduced by Delegates Nilan, Schebloom, Lindahl, Herschay and Johnston representing Post Office Clerks' Union No. 125, Minneapolis.

"Whereas the present cost of living has more than doubled for the postal clerk over the cost of living for the 1939-40 period; and

"Whereas the postal clerk is unable to properly fulfill his family obligations in regards to education, medical and dental care and the other necessities of life on his present postal salary; and

"Whereas the pay raise received by postal clerks in 1951 was wholly inadequate to meet the constantly rising cost of living: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor in Convention assembled in Minneapolis, Minn., October 6, 7 and 8 go on record as favoring a pay raise of \$600.00 in the next session of Congress for Postal employees."

The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 51

Introduced by Delegates representing Building Trades Council, Duluth.

"Whereas the Social Security Act does not now contain any provision for workers covered by the act in cases where they become physically disabled; and

"Whereas such workers otherwise must become recipients of public welfare or relief: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Duluth Building Trades Council does go on record as requesting the Minnesota State Federation of Labor to draw up and forward to our Minnesota congressional delegation a resolution which would provide payment of Social Security Act benefits to all workers who become disabled (and have less than 10 years left) to qualify for Social Security Act benefits."

The committee recommended that the resolve of the resolution be amended to read as follows:

"That the Duluth Building Trades Council does go on record as requesting the Minnesota State Federation of Labor to draw up and forward to our Minnesota Congressional delegation a resolution which would provide payment of Social Security Act benefits to all workers who become disabled and when so amended recommended concurrence in the resolution."

The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 57

Introduced by delegates representing Minnesota State Culinary Council.

"Whereas the Federal excise tax on distilled spirits is at an all-time high, and has reached the proportions of being an unfair and discriminatory tax; and

"Whereas such tax is resulting in decreased State and Federal revenues from alcoholic beverages, and an apparent increase in illegal distilling of spirits, both of which affect the employment, welfare, and security of persons employed in the dispensation of alcoholic beverages at retail level; and

"Whereas unless some relief from these excessive tax burdens is forthcoming the jobs of many people so engaged will be adversely affected: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor in convention assembled this 6th day of October 1952, go on record as supporting and strongly urging a reduction in the Federal excise tax on distilled spirits to a reasonable level of \$6 per gallon, and that the convention urge all members to take an active part in supporting this resolution, and a copy of the resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Minnesota."

The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 83

Introduced by delegates representing State Employees, District Council No. 3.

"Whereas the idea of according preference in examinations to honorably discharged veterans of the wars of the United States originated in non-civil-service examinations for Federal Government appointments following the war between the States and has been developed so that today the United States Government, the State governments, and nearly all subordinate jurisdictions with civil-service systems make some preference provisions for veterans generally by granting additional points in civil-service examinations; and

"Whereas the United States Government as the leading Nation in the international association of nations known as the United Nations is presently engaged in and has been engaged for many months in a nonaggressive undeclared war in Korea to protect our own Nation and other democratic Nations of the world against the determined aggression of the Communist states; and

"Whereas the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who serve in the Korean war are subjected to the rigors, the hardships and the dangers which have been experienced in other wars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates to the eighth international convention of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees assembled in Milwaukee, Wis., April 28 to May 2, 1952, recommend to and urge all the States which conduct competitive examinations for employments and all the subordinate jurisdictions in the States which conduct examinations for positions, to provide by law preference in examinations to veterans who shall have served in the Korean conflict so that such veterans will have opportunities in examinations for positions comparable with the opportunities accorded to veterans of World Wars I and II, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, signed by the international president and the international secretary-treasurer be mailed to the President of the United States, and to the clerk of the United States Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives."

The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON POSTAL SERVICE (S. REPT. NO. 7)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Committee on Postal Service, submitted, pursuant to section 12 (d), Public Law 233, Eighty-second Congress, the final report of that committee, which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 352. A bill for the relief of Joanna Maria Drucka-Podberezka; and

S. 353. A bill for the relief of Li Ming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 354. A bill for the relief of Inger Larson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 355. A bill for the relief of Wanda Luceri, also known as Sister Cecilia; Maria De Padora, also known as Sister Rosanna; Anna Santoro, also known as Sister Natalina; Valentina Ruffoni, also known as Sister Severina; Cosima Russo, also known as Sister Carmelina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 356. A bill for the relief of certain Greek aliens;

S. 357. A bill for the relief of Jung Yong He; and

S. 358. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Nesbitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 359. A bill providing aid to States for the purpose of assisting school districts in constructing urgently needed school facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 360. A bill to incorporate National Service Star Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 361. A bill to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 362. A bill for the relief of William Clark Vyse;

S. 363. A bill for the relief of Mildred T. Sackman;

S. 364. A bill for the relief of the Advance Seed Co., of Phoenix, Ariz.; and

S. 365. A bill for the relief of Alambert E. Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 366. A bill for the relief of Sister Concepts (Ida Riegel); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 367. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Frederick P. Knows Gun; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 368. A bill to provide for assistance to State agencies administering labor laws in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe work places and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower;

S. 369. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; and

S. 370. A bill to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 371. A bill for the relief of Georgia Andrews;

S. 372. A bill for the relief of Thomas T. Asami; and

S. 373. A bill to extend the time for filing claims for the return of property under the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina:

S. 374. A bill to retrocede the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of North Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 375. A bill for the relief of Rei Ishikawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 376. A bill to establish a temporary commission to investigate the costs and effects of watershed programs for flood control in agricultural watersheds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 377. A bill for the relief of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 378. A bill to expedite the naturalization of certain German and Austrian scientists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPFEL:

S. 379. A bill to permit the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenditures made by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 380. A bill to authorize the sale or lease by the State of Kansas of certain lands situated near Garden City, Kans.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 381. A bill for the relief of Donald Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 382. A bill to prevent discrimination against any type or strain of white clover seed in the application of any price-support programs for such seed; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 383. A bill for the relief of Francisca Egurola;

S. 384. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Webster; and

S. 385. A bill for the relief of Anna Soleniani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 386. A bill for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 387. A bill for the relief of David Wong;

S. 388. A bill for the relief of Wesley John Peterson;

S. 389. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexandre Demetrio Moruzi;

S. 390. A bill for the relief of Marie Haddad;

S. 391. A bill for the relief of Arsenios Peter Gligorievitch;

S. 392. A bill for the relief of Athanasios C. Papathanasiou; and

S. 393. A bill for the relief of Ivan Grbin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 394. A bill to require that collectors of customs and certain other officers of the Bureau of Customs be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 395. A bill to extend national service life-insurance benefits to certain members of the Armed Forces who died in combat with the Japanese forces prior to April 20, 1942, or whose deaths are traceable to capture, seige, or isolation by such forces;

S. 396. A bill relating to the payment of national service life insurance of Leo E. Chavez; and

S. 397. A bill to establish a separate customs collection district comprising the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 398. A bill to amend the mineral leasing laws in order to eliminate the waiver of rentals for oil and gas leases; and

S. 399. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 400. A bill for the relief of the town of Clayton, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 401. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Petrita P. Chavez;

S. 402. A bill for the relief of Roberta Madrigali;

S. 403. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara Gallegos;

S. 404. A bill for the relief of Renzo Petroni;

S. 405. A bill for the relief of Louis Rachid Habbid;

S. 406. A bill for the relief of Genovieve Bolf;

S. 407. A bill for the relief of Ernest A. Steinhoff;

S. 408. A bill for the relief of Jee Gene Wong;

S. 409. A bill for the relief of Maximiliano Barajas;

S. 410. A bill for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez;

S. 411. A bill for the relief of Michael Miakos;

S. 412. A bill for the relief of Maria Mes-sinesi;

S. 413. A bill to encourage the making of contracts with the United States by requiring the inclusion of an escalator clause to provide adjustments for approved price and wage increases;

S. 414. A bill for the relief of Hilary Hess;

S. 415. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria;

S. 416. A bill for the relief of Sam H. Ray; and

S. 417. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 418. A bill to provide that, in the determination of the amount which certain local educational agencies are entitled to receive for school construction purposes, no reduction in such amount shall be made for prior construction under the WPA, PWA, and NYA programs; and

S. 419. A bill to correct an injustice by providing for the refund of the taxes deducted pursuant to the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, from the wages of Mexican railroad workers employed in the United States under the agreement of April 29, 1943, between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 420. A bill amending the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, relative to periods of service of certain employees for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 421. A bill to authorize the construction of certain public works for flood control on the Rio Hondo at Roswell, N. Mex.;

S. 422. A bill to authorize a program for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention for the Pecos River watershed in New Mexico and Texas; and

S. 423. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself and Mr. CORDON):

S. 424. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida E. Horton; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 425. A bill granting exemption from income tax with respect to \$1,500 of the amount paid to any individual by the United States or by any State or political subdivision thereof as a pension, retired or retirement pay, or as a retirement annuity; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 426. A bill for the relief of Petre and Liubitze Ionescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 427. A bill to provide for uniforms for employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 428. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chih Chiang Teng;

S. 429. A bill for the relief of Hsian-Yun Hsu Teng, Wing Teng, Chie-Ling Teng, Yin Teng, and Fei Teng;

S. 430. A bill for the relief of Klaus W. Jonas and Ilse-dore Barkow Jonas;

S. 431. A bill for the relief of Joseph Di Pasquale; and

S. 432. A bill for the relief of Rodion Michael Akulshin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 433. A bill for the relief of Dr. John J. Ristow and family;

S. 434. A bill for the relief of Colette Joli; and

S. 435. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Kino-shita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 436. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the federally owned lands which are situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla., to the Army Board, State of Florida, in order to consolidate ownership and perpetuate the availability of Camp Blanding for military training and use; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 437. A bill for the relief of Lillian Kontou Coussouls; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 438. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the \$75 work clause; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRISWOLD:

S. 439. A bill for the relief of Don B. Whelan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 440. A bill to amend section 24 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the disallowance of certain deductions); and

S. 441. A bill to prohibit the procurement for the Armed Forces of any article produced in, or imported from, Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 442. A bill for the relief of Karen Kaye Simpson (Keiko Utagawa); and

S. 443. A bill for the relief of Pili Nyi Kwak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 444. A bill to improve and extend the duration of Public Law 874 of the Eighty-first Congress, to extend the period during which appropriations may be made to pay entitlements under title II of Public Law 815 of the Eighty-first Congress, to provide temporary supplementary aid for schools in critical defense housing areas, to make grants to States to assist distressed school districts in construction of urgently needed school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 445. A bill for the relief of Felicitos Valerina Margaret Hauke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 446. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Foster Creek reclamation project, Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 447. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Tountas (nee Vasiliki Georgion Karoumball);

S. 448. A bill for the relief of William Junior Jami and Sachiko Suwa;

S. 449. A bill for the relief of the city of Kirkland, Wash.;

S. 450. A bill for the relief of Gregorios Athanasios Fraggias;

S. 451. A bill for the relief of Gina Bellagamba;

S. 452. A bill for the relief of Imre Kapusy, Sr.;

S. 453. A bill for the relief of Holger Wilhelm Sjblom;

S. 454. A bill for the relief of Connie Joyce May (Ayako Goto); and

S. 455. A bill for the relief of Johan Gerhard Faber, Dagmar Anna Faber, Hilke Faber, and Frauke Faber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 456. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Cappelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 457. A bill for the relief of Carlos D. Markyna;

S. 458. A bill for the relief of Angelo Guri-setti Podesta; and

S. 459. A bill for the relief of Daphne Lharrison Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 460. A bill for expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public school board at Cass Lake, Minn., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district, and for other purposes; and

S. 461. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for post-graduate education in the field of public health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 462. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 463. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 464. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 465. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 466. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 467. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 468. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 469. A bill making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution to create a Great Lakes Water Level Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President by primary elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. GREEN):

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to establish a commission to assist in making a proper and equitable settlement of the submerged lands problem; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HOEY, and Mr. MORSE):

S. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution making January 20, 1953, a holiday for Federal employees, field service postal employees, and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. KNOWLAND when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

FEDERAL AID TO STATES FOR SCHOOL FACILITIES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill providing aid to States for the purpose of assisting school districts in constructing urgently needed school facilities. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 359) providing aid to States for the purpose of assisting school districts in constructing urgently needed school facilities, introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. CLEMENTS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLEMENTS ON SCHOOL-CONSTRUCTION BILL

This bill is designed to afford some measure of relief to the children of the country who are being forced to attend schools whose buildings are inadequate, unsafe, unsanitary, and overcrowded. These children have a national birthright to an adequate education, and that education must be given them in adequate facilities, or it becomes empty. We hear complaints almost every day from parents who fear for the safety of their children who must attend school in dilapidated and overcrowded buildings. Even, there have been parents' strikes against these intolerable conditions.

While many people may consider that the primary responsibility for education lies with the States and local school districts, we must admit that there is a national responsibility also. This bill will afford a minimum of Federal aid in the form of funds for school buildings. It is based upon a ratio of school-building cost to school-age populations in the several States. The Federal share is fixed on the same formula as found in the Hill-Burton Act, which has operated so well in our hospital-construction programs. It appears to be an equitable method for meeting the need in school construction. The adoption of this bill would tend to solve a pressing problem and be the means of housing our children in adequate school buildings.

RETROCESSION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which, if enacted, would give the people of the District of Columbia the same rights of citizenship enjoyed by other citizens of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 374) to retrocede the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland, introduced by Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

APPOINTMENT OF COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to require that collectors of customs and certain other officers of the Bureau of Customs be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me in explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 394) to require that collectors of customs and certain other officers of the Bureau of Customs be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement presented by Mr. THYE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE ON PROPOSED BILL CONCERNING APPOINTMENT OF COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to provide for the appointment of the Collectors of Customs and certain other officers of the Bureau of Customs under the classified civil-service system, because it seems to me that consideration should be given at this time to placing all revenue collectors in the same category. The President's reorganization plan for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which was approved by Congress last year, provided not only for revamping of the Bureau but for the appointment under civil service of those occupying positions now held by collectors.

There are 44 collectors of customs and 6 comptrollers of customs now appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They are collectors of import duties for the Government and administrators of the Customs Service. Their responsibilities are, roughly, the same as those of the present collectors of internal revenue. Whatever the ultimate plan may be for the organization of a consolidated revenue service in the Treasury Department, as recommended by the Hoover Commission, it seems entirely logical that collectors of customs should be appointed in the same manner as those performing the functions of collectors of internal revenue. The bill I have introduced is simply in the interests of logic and consistency, therefore, and is not intended to cast any reflection on present customs officials or agents or to offer a comprehensive plan for reorganization of the Customs Service.

Some curious twists in the development of laws and administrative regulations governing appointments of customs officials have occurred through the years. For example:

First, all the comptrollers of customs are political appointees except the person performing these functions at San Francisco, who is a career official.

Second, all those performing the functions of appraisers of customs are career officials, except the one at New York, who is a political appointee.

Third, 44 collectors of customs are Presidential appointees, and yet 2 other officials performing the same duties in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico are under Civil Service.

These inconsistencies highlight the need for the corrective legislation which I have proposed in the bill.

In this connection I wish to quote from the report to Congress of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government relative to the reorganization of the revenue services of the Treasury Department, as follows:

"One of the chief handicaps of effective organization of the Department is the political appointment of Collectors of Internal Revenue and of Customs, and certain other officials. The Commission recommends that all officials in the Department below the rank of Assistant Secretary should preferably be appointed from the career service without Senate confirmation."

The bill which I have introduced merely would place Bureau of Customs people in the same category as Bureau of Internal Revenue people as determined by the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952. This simple and logical step would in no way interfere with further consideration of over-all

reorganization of the revenue services along the lines recommended by the Hoover Commission.

CARLOS D. MARKYNA

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Carlos D. Markyna.

The subject of this bill is the foster son of Ted Pierce, Columbus weather man.

Markyna was born in Ecuador. He is a United States Army veteran and was wounded in Korea. He has been ordered deported, but physical deportation has been suspended because of my notice to the Immigration Department that I intended to introduce the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 457) for the relief of Carlos D. Markyna, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ANGELO GURISSETTI PODESTA

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Angelo Gurisetti Podesta.

John and Leah Podesta, of Cleveland, while in Italy, adopted an Italian boy. They are now paying for his support there but have not seen him since his adoption in April of 1952.

This bill would permit the child's entry to the United States as the natural-born alien child of the couple.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 458) for the relief of Angelo Gurisetti Podesta, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DAPHNE LHERRISON RODRIGUEZ

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Daphne Lherrison Rodriguez.

Daphne Rodriguez is a resident of Columbus, Ohio. She came to this country from Jamaica with an aunt. Apparently, her visitor's permit expired and she did not go home. That all happened in 1928.

Daphne is married to a lawful resident of the United States. She worked at Lazarus for 16 years, and now lives in Columbus. The bill would regularize her status without compelling her to return to Jamaica for reentry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 459) for the relief of Daphne Lherrison Rodriguez, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SECRETARY TO THE MAJORITY

Mr. TAFT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 29), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That William T. Reed, of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected secretary for the majority of the Senate.

REVIEW OF UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 30), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That, pursuant to its responsibilities under the second paragraph of section 2 of article II of the Constitution of the United States, the Senate requests and urges the President to take immediate steps under the provisions of article 109 of chapter XVIII of the Charter of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present Charter, and

That in furtherance of this purpose the Senate also urges the President to take such initial steps as are necessary to fix a date and place for the holding of the general conference and to secure the approval of two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly and of seven members of the Security Council for the calling and holding of this general conference under the provisions of the article and chapter of the United Nations Charter referred to in this resolution.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. IVES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 31), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to cloture) is modified as follows:

1. The first paragraph of subsection 2 is amended by striking out "except subsection 3 of rule 22."

2. The first paragraph of subsection 2 is amended by striking out "on the following calendar day but one," and inserting in lieu thereof, "on the twelfth calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays)."

3. The second paragraph of subsection 2 is amended by striking out "by two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn," and inserting in lieu thereof, "by the vote of a majority of the authorized membership of the Senate."

4. Subsection 3 is hereby deleted.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SCHOEPPPEL:

Inaugural address delivered by Gov. Edward F. Arn, of Kansas, on January 12, 1953, at Topeka, Kans.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Statement prepared by him relative to Senate bill 107, providing for the interim oil operation of submerged lands.

By Mr. WILEY:

Press release issued by him, in connection with new type bill for United States participation in construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, an editorial entitled "Seaway Will Be Built—Will United States Buy In?" published in the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette, January 10, 1953; and an editorial entitled "Revive St. Lawrence," published in the Providence Evening Bulletin of January 7, 1953.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Statement prepared by him relative to the retirement of Senator O'Connor, of Maryland. Declaration by the National Foreign Trade Council entitled "A Foreign Economic Policy for Americans," published in the New York Times of January 6, 1953.

Statement entitled "Facts on Liquor Taxation."

By Mr. HUNT:

Editorial entitled "A Great Senator," published in the Wyoming Eagle of January 9, 1953, referring to the senatorial career of Hon. Joseph C. O'Mahoney.

By Mr. WELKER:

Address delivered by President J. Reuben Clark, Jr., of the First Presidency, Church of Latter Day Saints, at Utah State Farm Bureau Federation convention, Hotel Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, November 21, 1952.

By Mr. HOEY:

Editorial entitled "Lynching: It Vanishes Without Federal Assistance," published in the Fayetteville (N. C.) Observer of recent date.

Editorial entitled "In Behalf of the Filibuster," published in the Washington Evening Star of January 8, 1953.

Editorial entitled "The Senate's Rules," published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 6, 1953.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

Editorial entitled "Free Trade Needed," published in the Stillwater (Okla.) News Press of December 24, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Higher United States Tariffs Would Set Europe Back," published in the Winston-Salem (N. C.) Journal of December 26, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Republican Trade Policy," published in the Washington Post of recent date.

Article by Sumner H. Slichter entitled "Slichter Urges Bold New Imports Policy," reprinted from the Atlantic magazine of January 1953.

By Mr. THYE:

Editorial entitled "When Policies Collide," published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of January 3, 1953, dealing with conflicting foreign policies.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Statement entitled "In the Balance—The Christian World," published in the Norwalk (Conn.) Hour.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	Kerr
Anderson	George	Kilgore
Barrett	Gillette	Knowland
Beall	Goldwater	Kuchel
Bennett	Gore	Langer
Bricker	Green	Lehman
Bridges	Grissold	Long
Bush	Hayden	Magnuson
Butler, Md.	Hendrickson	Malone
Butler, Nebr.	Hennings	Mansfield
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Martin
Capehart	Hill	Maybank
Carlson	Hoey	McCarran
Case	Holland	McCarthy
Chavez	Humphrey	Millikin
Clements	Hunt	Monroney
Cooper	Ives	Morse
Cordon	Jackson	Mundt
Daniel	Jenner	Murray
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Dworschak	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Payne
Ferguson	Kefauver	Potter
Flanders	Kennedy	Purtell

Robertson	Smith, N. J.	Tobey
Russell	Smith, N. C.	Watkins
Saltonstall	Sparkman	Welker
Schoeppel	Stennis	Wiley
Smathers	Taft	Williams
Smith, Maine	Thye	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] attended the inauguration yesterday of Governor Phil Donnelly at Jefferson City, Mo., and is therefore necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the appointment of committees under rule XXIV.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. I submit a list of Republican members, including the chairmen, and ask that it be read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, by direction of the Democratic Steering Committee, I submit the proposed Democratic membership of the standing committees of the Senate. The composition of these committees is based upon the 49-47 ratio which exists in the Senate. It is my understanding that traditionally it has been the obligation of the majority to make assignments of members who may not be members of either of the major parties.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have no objection to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Texas. However, the ratio in the Senate is not 49-47. The ratio is 48-47-1. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has stated that he is not a member of the Republican Party and does not wish to be assigned to committees by the majority. We have not undertaken to assign him to committees. I do not wish to be understood as being in agreement with the statement made by the distinguished minority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The VICE PRESIDENT. What the Chair was going to suggest was that, without objection, the two lists be read for the information of the Senate. The reading of the lists would not mean that the committee assignments as listed would be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Reserving my right to object for the moment, to even the reading of the lists, I should like to say that I appreciate very much the majority leader's characteristic fairness in making the observation that the Republican majority had decided not to assign the junior Senator from Oregon to a com-

mittee, and I wish to say to my good friend from Texas that, as a matter of parliamentary rule, it is my judgment that he is in error in his assumption that the assignment of a member of a minority party, who is not a member of either one of the so-called major parties, is the responsibility of the majority. In order to keep the record straight, and so that the observation may come at this point in the RECORD, it is the position of the junior Senator from Oregon that the assignment should come from the Senate as a whole, and I propose to argue that proposition a little later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon wish to have his list read for the information of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. I shall shortly make my list available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the two lists which have been submitted will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK read the lists, as follows:

On Agriculture and Forestry: George D. Aiken, of Vermont, chairman; Milton R. Young, of North Dakota; Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; John J. Williams, of Delaware; Andrew F. Schoeppel, of Kansas; Herman Welker, of Idaho; Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana; Clyde R. Hoey, of North Carolina; Olin D. Johnston of South Carolina; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Earle C. Clements, of Kentucky.

On Appropriations: Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, chairman; Homer Ferguson, of Michigan; Guy Cordon, of Oregon; Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Milton R. Young, of North Dakota; William F. Knowland, of California; Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota; Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois; Carl Hayden, of Arizona; Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Pat McCarran, of Nevada; Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico; Burnet R. Maybank, of South Carolina; Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana; Lister Hill, of Alabama; Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia; John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington.

On Armed Services: Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, chairman; Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey; Francis Case, of South Dakota; James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania; John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky; Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia; Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming; John C. Stennis, of Mississippi; Stuart Symington, of Missouri.

On Banking and Currency: Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana, chairman; John W. Bricker, of Ohio; Irving M. Ives, of New York; Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah; Prescott Bush, of Connecticut; J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland; Frederick G. Payne, of Maine; Barry Goldwater, of Arizona; Burnet R. Maybank, of South Carolina; J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas; A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; John Sparkman, of Alabama; J. Allen Frear, Jr., of Delaware; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Herbert H. Lehman, of New York.

On the District of Columbia: Francis Case, of South Dakota, chairman; Frank A. Barrett, of Wyoming; J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland; Frederick G. Payne, of Maine; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; Willis

Smith, of North Carolina; Albert Gore, of Tennessee; Mike Mansfield, of Montana;

On Finance: Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado, chairman; Hugh Butler, of Nebraska; Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania; John J. Williams, of Delaware; Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont; George W. Malone, of Nevada; Frank Carlson, of Kansas; Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah; Walter F. George, of Georgia; Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia; Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado; Clyde R. Hoey, of North Carolina; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; J. Allen Frear, Jr., of Delaware; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana.

On Foreign Relations: Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, chairman; H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa; Charles W. Tobey, of New Hampshire; Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; William Langer, of North Dakota; Homer Ferguson, of Michigan; William F. Knowland, of California; Walter F. George, of Georgia; Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island; J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas; John J. Sparkman, of Alabama; Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Mike Mansfield, of Montana.

On Government Operations: Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin, chairman; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois; John Marshall Butler, of Maryland; Charles E. Potter, of Michigan; John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; Clyde R. Hoey, of North Carolina; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts; Stuart Symington, of Missouri.

On Interior and Insular Affairs: Hugh Butler, of Nebraska, chairman; Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado; Guy Cordon, of Oregon; George W. Malone, of Nevada; Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah; Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; Thomas H. Kuchel, of California; Frank A. Barrett, of Wyoming; James E. Murray, of Montana; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; George A. Smathers, of Florida; Earle C. Clements, of Kentucky; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; Price Daniel, of Texas.

On Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Charles W. Tobey, of New Hampshire, chairman; Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana; John W. Bricker, of Ohio; Andrew W. Schoeppel, of Kansas; John Marshall Butler, of Maryland; John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky; Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska; Charles E. Potter, of Michigan; Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado; Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington; Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas; Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming; John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island; Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; George A. Smathers, of Florida.

On the Judiciary: William Langer, of North Dakota, chairman; Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; William E. Jenner, of Indiana; Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah; Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey; Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois; Herman Welker, of Idaho; John Marshall Butler, of Maryland; Pat McCarran, of Nevada; Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia; James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Willis Smith, of North Carolina; Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina; Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri.

On Labor and Public Welfare: H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey, chairman; Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Irving M. Ives, of New York; William A. Purcell, of Connecticut; Frank A. Barrett, of Wyoming; Barry Goldwater, of Arizona; James E. Murray, of Montana; Lister Hill, of Alabama; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Herbert H. Lehman, of New York; John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts.

On Post Office and Civil Service: Frank Carlson, of Kansas, chairman; James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania; William E. Jenner, of Indiana; John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky; Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska; William A.

Purtell, of Connecticut; Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island; Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; Price Daniel, of Texas.

On Public Works: Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, chairman; Francis Case, of South Dakota; Prescott Bush, of Connecticut; Thomas H. Kuchel, of California; J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland; ———; Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; John C. Stennis, of Mississippi; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; Albert Gore, of Tennessee; ———.

On Rules and Administration: William E. Jenner, of Indiana, chairman; Frank Carlson, of Kansas; Charles E. Potter, of Michigan; Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska; William A. Purtell, of Connecticut; Carl Hayden, of Arizona; Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island; Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa; Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the assignments to committees as proposed by the majority and by the minority. Does the Senator from Oregon wish to make a statement?

MR. TAFT. Does the Senator from Oregon wish to make a statement, or a further addition to the lists?

MR. MORSE. I wish to make a statement on the subject.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is before the Senate and it is debatable.

MR. TAFT. I understand that it is debatable. I shall wait and let the Senator from Oregon make his statement.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to make a statement. The Chair understands that there is no controversy with regard to committee assignments, except with respect to four committees. In other words, the assignments to the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Committee on the District of Columbia are the assignments to which the Senator from Oregon wishes to raise some question. Therefore, the Chair was going to suggest that so far as the remaining committees are concerned, the assignments to them could be agreed to.

MR. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to explain that the Republicans have nominated Republicans. We have not undertaken to assign the Senator from Oregon to a committee in making up our list of committee assignments.

Inasmuch as the Senator from Oregon has stated very definitely on the floor of the Senate that he does not want to be assigned to committees by the Republican caucus, we have assigned only the 48 Republican Senators to committees, and have, of course, selected the committees to which we wish to assign them.

The present status is that neither the Republican Senators nor the minority Senators are able, under the rules, to nominate the whole list; and there are two committee assignments to which up to date fall short by one of the total authorized by the rule, namely, the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Public Works.

MR. MORSE. Mr. President—

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized and may make his own presentation.

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend, the Senator from Ohio, that I think he and the other

Republican Senators were exactly correct in their procedure in not assigning me to any committees, not only because of my statement of the other day on the floor of the Senate that I did not wish to be so assigned by the Republican caucus, but also because it is my view that under the Reorganization Act I am entitled to assignment to committees as a member of a minority party, and by action of the Senate as a whole, acting as the Committee of the Whole, so to speak.

MR. PRESIDENT. I think it is only fair that at the very outset of this discussion this afternoon I be permitted to make the formal statement I wish to make in regard to what I believe to be an exceedingly important problem before the Senate, so that all my colleagues at least will have an opportunity to hear my point of view, if they wish to listen to it, or at least so far as the Record is concerned will have been placed on notice regarding that point of view.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall proceed to read my statement, and I wish to read it without interruption. This statement is based upon very careful research which I and my staff have conducted for the past several days in regard to what I believe to be a very historic parliamentary point which I propose to raise on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

Whether the junior Senator from Oregon receives the committee assignments to which he believes himself justly entitled is not the issue which is now before the Senate. This great parliamentary body, which should be a symbol of justice under law in these perilous days of contention between the free countries and the slave countries, must decide whether it will apply the Constitution and laws of the United States and the precedents of decades in the fair, impartial manner which characterizes democratic society and which sets it apart from the opportunistic totalitarian doctrine that the end justifies the means.

The case which the Senate must decide is new. No such combination of facts and law has been before the Senate in precisely the same posture. There are precedents which arose from similar controversies, but they have been sufficiently different to require that the discerning attention of every Member of this body be given to the present case.

I stand before the Senate, not as a member of either the Republican Party or the Democratic Party, but as an independent. Third parties are not new in this great Nation, and some have served high purposes. The Republican Party, when it was fresh and new, was a spirited creature which outran the Whig Party, whose trembling, infirm hands could not hold the reins of power and responsibility. The Populist Party served the great purpose of regenerating the two major parties by sharpening the issues which perplexed the Nation in the closing decades of the nineteenth century. Theodore Roosevelt was as much a Bull Mooser as a Rough Rider.

Today I stand alone in this Chamber as the representative of the independents. As a Senator I represent the people of Oregon, who twice elected me, and I also am spokesman of hun-

dreds of thousands of independents who refuse to accept kinship with the donkey and who cannot and will not follow the lumbering meanderings of the elephant.

No Senator would contend that he represents only those of his party who live in his State. This would be a mean admission of myopic partisanship and provincialism. We represent our States; and we seek to advance, each according to his lights, the welfare of all the people.

As I said in my State about 3 weeks ago, in a series of major speeches which I made across the State, I have for 8 years represented in the Senate of the United States all the people of my State, including those who have voted against me as well as those who have voted for me. In the remaining 4 years of my present term in the Senate of the United States I shall continue to represent all the people of Oregon in accordance with my best judgment on the merits of issues as I see them, including a representation of those who voted for me as well as a representation of those who voted against me. In those speeches, Mr. President, and in the open-forum periods which followed them, I went on to make very clear my reply to a series of resolutions which I have received from various Republican committees and organizations in my State which have asked that I resign from the Senate of the United States because I have resigned from the Republican Party. However, my reply to them was the same as my reply to them today, namely, that when I took the oath of office as a Member of the Senate of the United States I did not become the property of the Republican Party. I became a representative of all the people of my State, and I took that oath of office with a determination to keep faith with a pledge which I made in 1944 and again in 1950, namely, that I would exercise an honest independence of judgment on the merits of the issues in accordance with the facts as I found them or believed them to be, always subordinating, in the best interests of my country, what I consider to be political partisanship to what I consider to be sound political principle.

MR. PRESIDENT. My record in the Senate of the United States for the next 4 years will be no different from what my record has been in the past 8 years. I shall continue to keep faith with that pledge. I wish to say that in my judgment it is the highest type of representation for a member of any party, be he Democrat or Republican or independent, to follow in the Senate of the United States.

As I have said, Mr. President, I represent independents. They merit recognition. The number of their representatives in the Congress of the United States may grow, I believe. They may serve to accelerate the realignment of forces within the present national parties. In either case, these hundreds of thousands of American citizens cannot be ignored merely because they have not yet learned the ways of the local political clubhouse.

Each of us here is a member of a party, but each of us here represents a constituency defined by the Constitution of the United States. Naked power can

deny to our constituencies the representation they deserve and expect; but if the junior Senator from Oregon can be denied the committee assignments to which the Constitution, the laws, the rules, and the precedents governing this body entitle him, no Senator or no constituency is safe. In my judgment, this situation is a challenge to democracy.

Mr. President, I see a constitutional issue before the Senate this afternoon.

Article V of the Constitution provides:

No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

The history of this sole unamendable provision of our charter is well known. It was designed to balance representation between the small and large States. It represents a compromise in the noblest sense of the term—a harmonization of conflicting and legitimate principles.

To deny any fraction of the normal rights of a Senator, not in his own capacity but as a representative of a State, is to compromise, in the ugliest sense of that term, a basic guaranty without which the infant alling confederation could not have been reborn into a thriving Federal Union.

It is the history of liberty that it is eroded into bondage, not boldly attacked and subdued.

Each State and its representatives must stand equally in this forum. Any detraction from that equality is an abridgment of constitutional guaranties—in this case those which should protect the people of Oregon. Tomorrow, it could be any State in the Union.

Whether I remain on the committees on which I have served and whose work I have learned for many years is not a matter of grave importance to me as an individual. I will stand at this desk—or another—and make my views known and fight for what I believe to be true, honest, good, and in the public interest. Relegation to a minor committee might be punishment designed to make my task more difficult.

But punitive measures of this sort are not designed to punish the offending. As we well know, it is a terroristic device to inhibit the timid and shackle the weak. And for what purpose? To require regularity, compel compliance, and insure against insubordination. Who, then, is to be the judge of orthodoxy and the censor of this body? The recent past is replete with examples of freemen voting such power to their future inquisitors.

If this is not the issue, then is the issue one of party discipline? Again, I ask, for what purpose?

I believe profoundly that the majority party must have responsibility for whatever legislative program it plans. That is why, Mr. President, when there was a running debate in the press some weeks ago as to what position the junior Senator from Oregon would take on any question of organizing the Senate, each and every Member of this body who knows me should have known, without it being necessary for the junior Senator from Oregon to say so, of my deep conviction that party responsibility ought to rest upon the majority party in the Senate of the United States. I was somewhat astounded, Mr. President, that

the question should continually arise, "What is the junior Senator from Oregon going to do?" When I realized that people were taking seriously the doubt as to what I was going to do, I issued my statement, and my statement was exactly that everyone should have expected. I said, "On the reorganization of the Senate of the United States I shall vote with the Republicans, because I think it perfectly clear, as a result of the election of November 4, that legislative responsibility should be placed upon the Republican Party."

I said it, Mr. President, when some doubt was expressed, at least in the press, as to what the outcome of the final official vote in some States might be as to who was going to control the Senate of the United States. I wanted my position perfectly clear, that, in my judgment, I could not possibly have justified sitting in the Senate of the United States on the basis of the result of the votes on November 4 and not vote in favor of the Republican Party organizing the Senate. But I also said in that statement, it will be recalled, that "every Republican on the floor of the Senate knows that within the hour after they get through disciplining me—I said then, 'on January 3,' but, of course, referring to the time when the discipline was to be imposed—that 'within 1 hour after the time they get through disciplining me on January 3, if an issue came before the Senate on the merits of which I thought the Republican side of the aisle was correct I would vote with the Republicans.'"

Therefore, my Republican colleagues knew full well that whatever discipline they sought to inflict upon me was not going to cost them anything so far as my position on the merits of the issues immediately following the discipline or at any other time was concerned. And that is true today, because never do I intend to lower myself to the level of partisanship. I shall never sit in the Senate of the United States and cast a vote on the basis of partisanship, irrespective of what partisan punishment may be inflicted upon me for my views or course of action in the Senate of the United States. So I repeat, Mr. President, that a punitive measure of this sort is not designed to punish the offending. As we well know, it is a terroristic device to inhibit the timid and shackle the weak.

If this is not the issue, Mr. President, then, I ask again, is the issue one of party discipline; and if so, for what purpose? I not only believe profoundly that the majority party must have responsibility for whatever legislative program it plans, but to discharge that responsibility it must have the authority to report and act upon bills, and so far as Senate organization is concerned, in my judgment it is entitled to a party majority on each and every committee of the Senate of the United States. So I say it cannot exercise that party responsibility unless its avowed members have a numerical majority on each committee and can effectively move legislation through committees to consideration on the floor of the Senate. Only in that manner can our kind of representative government function, and only in that manner can a party be held accountable

for what it does and what it fails and refuses to do.

No party is unitary and wholly united. I have no counsel to offer today to the two Republican Parties to enable them to act as one party.

There was a time when the minority party—the Republican Party of the 1850's—had only one or two members on some committees and none on many others—McConachie, Congressional Committees, 1908, cited in Haynes, *The Senate of the United States*, page 288, paragraph 4. As I go along, I shall cite my authority for each statement I make by a documentation of the authority, because I believe that on this particular issue the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should show the documentation. Of course, the reference now is to McConachie, Congressional Committees, 1908, cited in Haynes, *The Senate of the United States*, page 288, paragraph 4. Our form of government and the Republican Party apparently do not long sanction such inequality. The Republican Party came into power from a small minority in 1861, after the election of 1860.

There is a recognized and proper role for a minority to perform. And no one minority has a monopoly on that role—if, indeed, some live up to it at all.

Recognition of the rights of minorities is not a matter of charity, nor is it a measure of power. The Constitution is devoted in large measure to the protection of minority rights to the end that the free interchange of independently formulated ideas may enrich our society.

There is also the candid recognition that what is today a minority or a group may grow and emerge and coalesce into a new and different majority. We must look to the future and balance the precarious advantage of the hour against the uncertainties of the future.

The Senate has a constitutional obligation to apply its rules governing committee assignments even-handedly.

Haynes, the authoritative historian of the Senate, at page 294 of his book previously cited, states:

Once placed upon a congenial committee, a Senator is likely to retain that assignment as long as he remains in the Senate, or until he requests to be excused from further service thereon.

I repeat, Mr. President, because in my study of the precedents of this problem, I think Haynes is right, save and except for the one exception to which I shall refer shortly, that the history of the Senate of the United States, so far as the matter of committee assignments is concerned has been that, once placed upon a congenial committee, as Haynes points out, a Senator is likely to retain that assignment as long as he remains in the Senate, or until he requests to be excused from further service thereon.

I digress at this point, Mr. President, because I think it is an appropriate place to insert it, that I would have my colleagues in the Senate this afternoon not treat the term "seniority" as referring merely to one type of seniority in the Senate of the United States. I would have my colleagues keep in mind, if they will study the history of the development of the Senate rules, that seniority is a two-pronged phenomenon, seniority in the Senate and seniority in committee.

I respectfully submit to my colleagues that seniority in the Senate is a matter of senatorial jurisdiction by the entire body over each Member of the Senate, and seniority within committee is a matter of jurisdiction by the parties represented on the committee. In my conversations with some of my colleagues I respectfully say that in some instances they were not, in my opinion, drawing this distinction, because each and every Member of this body has a precious interest in seniority in its total meaning in the Senate of the United States—seniority in the Senate and seniority on committees.

Mr. President, I want to say, because I always put my cards on top of the table, that I assumed that in the assignment of committees the Senate of the United States would not weaken the precious right of every Member of this body to his seniority in the Senate when it came to the assignment of Members to committees, and that it would follow the precedent established by the United States Senate, which, with one exception, has been to leave a Senator on a committee until he himself asked to be removed from it. But if left on the committee I fully expected—and I would have taken the position that it was the right of the Republican Party in the Senate of the United States to take such action—to be reduced to the bottom of the committee table, so far as seniority on the committee is concerned. It is my view that as a member of the committee and a member of a third party, I would have to stand, so far as my seniority rights on the committee were concerned, with reference to my membership in the party, and that would make me, from the standpoint of committee seniority, a freshman on the committee. But that would not be my seniority status in the Senate of the United States. As the statistics will show, I am one of the "upper classmen" in the Senate, so far as Senate seniority is concerned.

The all but unbroken rule of this body is that a Senator once assigned to a committee is not thereafter removed in contravention of his seniority without his consent. I am talking, in that sense, about Senate seniority and not committee seniority. To do otherwise, to apply special rules to individual cases, is to deny equal representation in the Senate to each State.

THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

No issue of committee assignments, whether to rebels who remained in a party, to those who incurred the wrath of party leaders, or to third-party representatives, ever came before the Senate when legislation governing committee assignments was in force.

Rule XXV—page 40 of the Manual—provides in part:

4. Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia or of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may serve on three standing committees and no more.

No such explicit enactment was on the books when similar, but different, cases were before this body.

Mr. President, the rule requires that each Senator shall serve on two committees. That is mandatory language. The remainder of the sentence is permissive and points up the command of the first portion.

The purpose and application of this provision are most relevant to its requirements.

Congress, after many years of considering measures of this type, enacted this remedial code of conduct. In main part it was designed to eliminate the confusion and duplication of some 34 committees which had no defined jurisdiction. Some old committees, such as that on manufactures, were eliminated as useless and as unused as the human appendix. Other committees of similar and overlapping jurisdiction were combined. This was a rational act for a rational purpose.

Senate committees were to function as the opposite number of the same committee in the House and of the principal Government agencies. Only by specialization by committees and members could the Congress cope with the growing complexities of Government. Committee membership was designed to impart the knowledge and expertness which only long association and experience can give.

This in miniature was a parallel to the decision of the Founding Fathers who chose a 6-year term for Senators—one not so long as to breed an autocratic body out of touch with the people, but with sufficient tenure to provide continuity, experience, and stability to the Republic.

This was well expressed in the Federalist—No. 62:

Another defect to be supplied by a Senate lies in a want of due acquaintance with the objects and principles of legislation. It is not possible that an assembly of men called for the most part from pursuits of a private nature, continued in appointment for a short time, and led by no permanent motive to devote the intervals of public occupation to a study of the laws, the affairs, and the comprehensive interests of their country, should, if left wholly to themselves, escape a variety of important errors in the exercise of their legislative trust. It may be affirmed, on the best grounds, that no small share of the present embarrassments of America is to be charged on the blunders of our governments; and that these have proceeded from the heads rather than the hearts of most of the authors of them. What indeed are all the repealing, explaining, and amending laws, which fill and disgrace our voluminous codes, but so many monuments of deficient wisdom; so many impeachments exhibited by each succeeding against each preceding session; so many admonitions to the people, of the value of those aids which may be expected from a well-constituted Senate?

I am not reading about the Government of the United States in 1953, Mr. President, although this language aptly applies, in my judgment, to the Government of the United States in 1953. I am reading from the Federalist, about the problems which arose legislatively almost at the time of the birth of the Nation itself.

A good government implies two things: first, fidelity to the object of government, which is the happiness of the people; secondly, a knowledge of the means by which that object can be best attained.

This was in the forefront of the minds of those who fashioned the Reorganization Act. Senator La Follette, who fathered and guided the measure through the Senate, stated during the debate—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 5, page 6533:

The second principle was in that process to gather together in the jurisdiction of the reorganized committees the principal and related subject matters of their respective areas of jurisdiction, in order that Senators might become familiar with those subjects, in order that they might become better informed, and in order that those who did so become informed through service would bring the light of their experience and information to bear, insofar as possible, upon all matters of a similar nature. That thread runs all the way through this reorganization proposal.

I think that is a pretty sound statement, Mr. President, one which my colleagues in the Senate should keep uppermost in their minds today as they come to pass upon the issue which I raise before the Senate.

That was the position taken by one of the fathers of the Reorganization Act. There sits on this floor today a Senator from Oklahoma, the other major author of the Reorganization Act [Mr. MONROE]. I dare say that if he wishes to participate later on in the afternoon in this discussion as to the meaning and the purpose of the Reorganization Act, upon the basis of which the junior Senator from Oregon rests a part of his case, he will agree with the quotation which I just read from the former Senator from Wisconsin when he referred to the action taken by the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Senator White, of Maine, then the minority leader, stated in the course of the hearings—hearings on House Concurrent Resolution 18, Seventy-ninth Congress, page 394:

It is a perfectly terrific headache * * * to make committee assignments. We have * * * in the Senate followed the practice that seniority has been the determining factor.

Senator Burton also endorsed the merits of committee assignment by seniority—in the same place, page 812.

The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], then a distinguished Representative and a recognized student of parliamentary organization, observed that the seniority system had weaknesses, but stated that he could offer no practical alternative—in the same place, page 72.

And of great force are the precedents of 157 years of Senate practice which, under the ordinary rules of legislative construction, may be taken to have been adopted and ratified by the act.

The application of the act in 1947, the first year of its use—at the outset of the famous Eightieth Congress—further supports this view.

The long-time chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], was ranked on that committee above colleagues of less seniority who came from the Military Affairs Committee, such as Senators HILL and KILGORE, by virtue of his lengthier service on the Committee on Naval Affairs. And, quite obviously, in compress-

ing military and naval affairs it was the less senior on both who gave way to the more senior on both.

Of the 95 other Senators in this present body, only 27 have had continuous service predating that of the junior Senator from Oregon—11 Republicans and 16 Democrats. I say to them, as I say to the newest freshman Senator, the principles which you apply to me are the selfsame principles that apply to you. They are the rules which have advanced and will advance you in recognition of years of service and experience.

I read in the newspapers, which, by choice, is where I learn about the Republican Party, that there is some slight misunderstanding about senatorial courtesy and the distribution of patronage. Tomorrow one or more of my colleagues may find themselves in open conflict with the adopted leader of their party.

The majority and minority leaders have today introduced, not an order for committee assignments, but a flashing two-handed samurai sword. Mr. President, in addition to two handles, that sword has two glistening edges. Indeed, it is far too big to rend merely one Senator. It may have so much momentum that the Senate will look like an Alice in Wonderland garden party.

PAST ACTIONS OF THE SENATE

I have researched the precedents of the Senate and consulted the erudite Parliamentary of the Senate, and plumbed biographies and political commentaries.

I can report that this search has uncovered but one instance, out of many conflicts, in which a Senator has been removed from a committee in contravention of his seniority.

That single reprisal is a disgraceful one which occurred in 1871, the first year of General Grant's administration. I suggest that the crusade of the new administration avoid such militant examples.

Senator Sumner, who had served so admirably during many years, came into collision with the general on a matter of foreign policy. The Republican caucus not only voted to demote Sumner from the chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee, but excluded him from that committee entirely. Sumner refused to accept any other committee assignments thereafter—Haynes, *The Senate of the United States*, 1938, pages 302-303. In all its history, no political disagreement, no political divorce, led to such an outcome.

There were several instances in which overage Senators, or Senators who opposed party leaders, were denied continuation as committee chairmen; but in no such case was the Senator who fell or fought from favor removed from the committee on which he sat.

So the redoubtable Stephen Douglas, who had supported Buchanan for the Presidency, bitterly and publicly opposed him on the important issue of the Kansas Constitution. In 1859, Douglas was not continued as chairman of the Committee on Territories, but remained as next ranking member and retained his post and seniority on another major committee—Johnson, *Life of Stephen A. Douglas*, 1908, pages 277-279, 395-396.

Senator Cummins was passed over for continuation as a committee chairman, primarily because of old age; but unpopular views were a consideration. Nonetheless, he was ranked as second among his party on that committee—Haynes, pages 303-304.

Senator Ladd and three colleagues who were Republicans, or had accepted committee assignments from the Republican Party, had campaigned for "Old Bob" La Follette for President in 1924. La Follette died before the Senate organized in 1925. The victorious Republicans excluded his supporters from the party conference, and voted to demote Senator Ladd from the chairmanship of the Public Lands Committee.

I am always appreciative when kindness is shown me. There is this difference between the situation now and that in 1925, when Senator Ladd and the others were excluded from the party conference: I was not excluded from the party conference. The Republicans were very kind to send me an official invitation, as every other Republican in the Senate received one, to attend the party conference. But I felt, under the circumstances in which I found myself, and in view of the course of action I intend to pursue in American politics as an independent, that it certainly would not be in good taste for me, or very sporting of me, to attend a conference of a party to which I no longer belonged. However, I wish to say to my Republican friends in the Senate that I deeply appreciate the invitation.

In 1925 the situation was a little different, Mr. President. The Republicans who, so the records show, had supported, old Bob La Follette in 1924 were not invited to the party conference, but neither were they removed from their committees. They did deny to Senator Ladd his committee chairmanship but not his committee membership. At least that is what the research on this subject shows. Over the opposition of Senators Norris and Borah, the Senate upheld that determination. But none was banished to the captive city of the District of Columbia. Each continued on the committees on which he was serving—some with loss of intracommittee seniority—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 67, part 1, pages 14-17, 41 and the following, April 7 and 9, 1925, Haynes, page 291.

It should be noted that Ladd asserted that he remained a Republican and did not seek appointment as an independent. I would not contend that a nonmember of the majority should be a committee chairman, as I have already stated. Nor would I contend that a nonmember of the majority should even be assigned to committees by the majority, except as members of the majority act as individual Members of the Senate on the floor of the Senate, considering this problem as a problem of the Committee of the Whole.

Norris himself later campaigned for Al Smith, while Senator Heflin crossed over to support Hoover. Neither was subjected to any reprisal, and Norris continued in the powerful chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee.

Referring for a moment to the situation in 1925, Burton K. Wheeler, a Demo-

crat, who was vice presidential candidate on the ticket in 1924 with La Follette, called me some time ago and said he wanted to tell me he knew what I was going through, and that he greatly sympathized with the position in which I found myself. He then went on to discuss with me briefly, over the telephone, some of the incidents of 1925, and he pointed out that no so-called party disciplinary action was taken against him as a result of his campaign for the vice presidency on a third-party ticket. I may say again that such disciplinary action does not concern me one way or the other, Mr. President. But he went on to say that his seniority rights, insofar as his committee positions were concerned, were in no way affected by his course of action.

THE ASSIGNMENT OF INDEPENDENTS

Early newly elected independents did not fare too well. Senators Hale and Salmon P. Chase, Free Soilers, refused appointments as Whigs or Democrats and sought to act as their own committee on committees in the 1850's. They were given no assignments, but the rules did not require committee service, as the Legislative Reorganization Act does today. In 1853 the Whigs refused to name Sumner to a committee, but left a vacancy on a minor one, to which the Democrats appointed him. But in 1855 the emerging Republicans were given a role in committee assignments, and were not merely put on committees without consultation—Haynes, pages 287-288.

In later years Populists and Farmer-Laborites were given a voice in their committee assignments.

Haynes sums up the situation as follows:

The shifting of party strength or the advent of a new party group may call for readjustment most easily met by the enlargement of the committees (Haynes, p. 278).

I wish to repeat that sentence, because it will deal with one of two possible motions which I shall make later this afternoon. Haynes states:

The shifting of party strength or the advent of a new party group may call for readjustment most easily met by the enlargement of the committees.

Thus . . . in the Sixty-eighth Congress additional places were provided for the members of the Farmer-Labor Party upon several of the committees to which they were assigned (Haynes).

It is just this plan which I propose to the Senate. I would add that my proposal is reinforced by the Reorganization Act, which certainly was not in force in the instances cited. Moreover, I have an accumulated seniority which none of the Populists, nor Farmer-Laborites, nor Free Soilers had when they made their claims.

I suggest to the Senate that I will be no less vocal nor active when labor or defense legislation is before the Senate if I am not on the committees which consider such measures.

I shudder to think that some of my colleagues would prefer my absence from committee deliberations for the reason that I have some unique experience to offer—such as my unsettling survey of military waste in NATO, based upon an inspection tour of NATO bases requiring

more than 30,000 miles of travel during the past fall, with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. This was an investigation the results of which, in part, will be set forth in a committee report which we intend to release to the Senate within the very near future; and we shall release to the Armed Services Committee, in executive session, certain observations which, for security reasons, should not be made public in a Senate report.

THE SENATE IS A CONTINUING BODY

At the very opening of this Congress the Senate engaged in a historic debate over its rules. Many Senators argued that new rules could be adopted by a majority on the theory that the Senate is not a continuing body. The opponents of the rule change, led by the majority leader, contended vociferously that the Senate is a continuing body.

In support of this stand, the Republican policy committee brief—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 7, 1953, pages 165 to 178—cited the continuing nature of Senate committees—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 7, 1953, page 170. In my comments upon this controversy I argued that new rules could be adopted—but supported the argument that this body continues to exist without a break.

I digress to say one day during that debate, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said to me in the cloak room, "I have not heard you participate in the debate." I replied that I was listening to the debate, but that he had not heard me participate in a discussion of the issue of whether or not the Senate was a continuing body because I had grave doubts about the legal validity of the argument that the Senate is not a continuing body. A check of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that when I came to the point of making my final decision as to the position I should take on the Anderson motion, I made it clear that I was taking my position not on the basis of the issue as to whether or not the Senate is a continuing body, because I stated that there were those of us in the Senate who favored the motion, but for another reason.

I then set forth my position, that I favored the Anderson motion on the basis of the argument that, as a matter of sound public policy, I believed that at the beginning of this session of Congress we should amend rule XXII, not on the ground that the Senate is a continuing body, or is not a continuing body, but on the ground that I felt that the beginning of the session offered the best time opportunity for amending a rule which, in my judgment, must be amended if the Senate is ever to return to the application of the majority-vote principle.

The precedents of the Senate show that all committees continue without changes in membership except those necessary to insure numerical control and chairmanship by membership of the majority party.

Haynes, the Senate historian, observes:

When a party gets the opportunity to reorganize the Senate committees, therefore, it does not mean a wholesale overturn. To cite the illustration of most moment in the Re-

publican reorganization in 1919: In the previous Congress the Committee on Foreign Relations had included 10 Democrats and 7 Republicans. Under the new organization that ratio was precisely reversed. The Democrats were reduced to 7 by dropping the minority Senators who had seen shortest service on the committee; to bring the Republican membership up to 10 there were added to the 6 holdover Republicans 4 new men.

I submit to the Senate that it cannot one week argue that the Senate is a continuing body and then the next week take a contrary position for political expediency. It is the history of this body that a Senator once elected has continuous membership in the Senate. It is the practice of this body that once assigned to a committee, a Senator has continuing membership upon that committee unless he is the least senior of the minority who must be displaced in order to insure majority control.

There can be no doubt that the Senate has the naked power to do what the majority leader proposes that it do, but the issue of power should not be dispositive in any parliamentary group and is not the determining factor with the electorate.

There is no legal appeal from the decision of the Senate, but Senators must justify their action to the American people and to their consciences.

What the Senate does today may live to plague many Members here. Any breach of law and precedent which they permit themselves to indulge in may be designed to injure me for partisan political purposes today. I will not be injured. But, I warn the Senate that the history of the decay of democracy is pitted with incidents of this kind. The hounds of today may very well be the hares of tomorrow.

It is the duty of Senators today to bolster the rules which have been made for the protection of all the people, each State, and every Member of this body. Only in that way can they protect their future individual integrity as Senators.

In closing I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the full meaning of seniority rights in the Senate of the United States. I believe seniority to mean that each Member has seniority rights as a Member of the Senate itself; and, of course, he has seniority rights, as a member of a party, on committees of the Senate.

I want my colleagues in the Senate to keep in mind the fact that today it may be the junior Senator from Oregon against whom this particular action is taken, an action almost singular in the history of the Senate. Tomorrow it may be someone else in the Senate who answers, as did I, the call of his own conscience as to what intellectual honesty compels him to do in the midst of a political campaign. I have no regrets for answering that question of conscience, and I am perfectly willing to be judged in terms of history by the answers I gave in the course of the campaign, and by future events as they develop with the oncoming administration.

I wish to say to my friends in the Senate: "Keep in mind, whether you like it or not, that history places you in a position this afternoon where you will be voting for the first time on a precedent

under the Reorganization Act of 1946, and that a vote in favor of carrying out the proposal now before the Senate would be to remove the junior Senator from Oregon from two committees on which he now presently serves, and thus would establish a precedent which you may some day rue, because you may discover that it was a precedent created at a time when you turned your heads away from the great historic precedents of the Senate."

Mr. President, at the appropriate time—because I propose to listen to the debate on the subject—and so that my colleagues will have notice of what my plan is for the afternoon, I shall move that the Senate elect me a member of the Committee on Armed Services and a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, so that I may continue, on the basis of my seniority in the Senate, my many years of service on those committees, and give to them my knowledge and experience gained from my previous work on them.

I may also at a later time make a motion, depending upon the parliamentary situation, that, if the Senate prefers, it may enlarge those two committees by placing on them an additional member of the majority party, along with the junior Senator from Oregon as the member of a minority party.

My study of the parliamentary situation satisfies me that such a motion would be a perfectly appropriate one, although I am aware of the fact that to make it, it would be necessary to serve notice of the motion and have it lie on the table for a day, and then have it taken up at the next session of the Senate.

I may say also that I have sought, and shall continue to seek, to discuss the subject on the basis of principles, not on the basis of personalities. I assure my friends in the Senate that I have no personal bitterness about it. I fully understood, when I took the course of action which I took during the recent campaign, that undoubtedly I would create problems for myself in the Senate parliamentarily and procedurally speaking. However, Mr. President, no one in this body has the right to question the right of a Senator to enter the sanctum of his own conscience. When one enters that sanctum he goes into communion with his Creator.

When I came out of that communion, Mr. President, I had to answer in the affirmative the pounding question of my conscience which had been bombarding me day and night for a period of time theretofore:

Do you not owe a duty to the country to do more than merely refuse to campaign for your party? Do you not owe a duty, on the basis of the convictions which you have reached, to tell the people of your country why you think the leader of the party to which you have belonged should not be elected President of the United States?

When I came out of that sanctum and communion I knew that the answer to the question was "Yes." I proceeded to act accordingly. I proceeded to keep faith with the principle of political ethics for which I have stood in American politics since I was elected to the Senate.

Back in 1944, when my good friend from Minnesota, Joe Ball, a Republican Senator, campaigned for Franklin D. Roosevelt for President of the United States, I made a public statement then, that when Senator Ball took that position he should have resigned from the Republican Party.

I drew the distinction in 1944—and I have repeated it many times since—that a man holding high office in one of the parties has the right to take a walk. By that I have always explained I meant that he had the right to refuse to campaign for his party's candidate and to remain silent, so to speak; but he had no right, as a matter of political ethics, to bolt his party and campaign for the candidate of the party of the opposition without resigning from his party.

Thus, Mr. President, when I answered the question of my conscience as to what was my duty in the 1952 campaign I proceeded to transcribe a speech for delivery in the State of Oregon, in which I first made my announcement of resignation from the Republican Party. I said that I would keep faith with what I had told the people of Oregon many times, namely, that if I ever found myself in a position where I felt my conscience directed me to bolt my party I would resign from it. That I did. I also told them in that speech, as I have in other speeches, that I would continue for the next 4 years to exercise an honest independence of judgment and to do what was right on the merits of an issue, and then let the people determine in 1956, when I run as a candidate for reelection to the Senate, as an independent, whether they want that kind of representation.

I shall always be glad to abide by the decision of the voters at the ballot box. I may say to my political opposition that I shall do my best in 1956 to bring to the State of Oregon a campaign of political education on the merits of the issues, so that the people of Oregon will know clearly how I stand on the merits of the issues. I have complete confidence that once they know the facts they will approve the kind of independent representation I will have given them for 12 years in the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon has discussed various constitutional questions and various questions of conscience, which are interesting, and which no doubt will be the subject of discussion, but which, in my opinion, have no relation to the issue before the Senate today.

The problem arises today because of a peculiar situation with respect to the number of Members of the Senate and because of the provisions of the La Follette-Monroney Act, as amended recently by unanimous vote of the Senate. That fact does not change the basic situation. There are certain fundamental facts on which I believe we can agree and with respect to which the distinguished Senator from Oregon also agrees.

One of them is that in the Senate today there are 48 Republicans and 47 Democrats and 1 independent. The distinguished Senator from Oregon has

made that clear. He said in a speech a few days ago:

I wish to say that I do not want to be assigned to committees by the Republican Party.

We did not assign him to committees. He said further:

I happen to stand alone in the Senate today as an independent, and there are thousands like me across the Nation.

He said also:

The last third-party Member of the Senate was the distinguished Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., of the State of Wisconsin.

He implied that he regards himself as a member of a third party.

Therefore we have three parties in the Senate. The only reason that we control the Senate, more or less by sufferance at the moment, is that on the 20th of January the new Vice President will take office and under the rule he is permitted to vote when there is a tie. The Republican control of the Senate is not based upon the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

I think it is also obvious that we operate under the two-party system.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon made the statement this afternoon that the majority should clearly have control of all committees of the Senate. As a matter of fact, under the La Follette-Monroney Act, no provision was made for a condition in which a majority was acquired by 48 Senators and the Vice President. That act provided for a condition in which the proportion would be 49 to 47, but did not provide for a condition in which a majority would be obtained under such conditions as prevail today.

The result is that we have assigned all the Republican Senators to all the committee positions to which we are entitled under the La Follette-Monroney Act. We cannot put another Republican Senator on another committee. We might shift the committee assignments; but after doing that we still would fall two short of controlling all the committees of the Senate. That is because under the La Follette-Monroney Act there could be only 11 more majority members than minority members on the committees, under the present party membership situation in the Senate. The result is that we can have control of 13 of the standing committees of the Senate, but we cannot have control of the other two standing committees of the Senate. I did my best to persuade the distinguished minority leader and the minority whip and the other minority members that they should do their best to give us 15 more members who could serve on three committees. But they were not open to persuasion. Perhaps they might be later. However, the action taken had to be taken by substantially majority consent, and I had to yield on that point.

Consequently, under present circumstances there is no way by which we could assign the Senator from Oregon to two committees and still could avoid creating such a situation that the Senator from Oregon, together with the Democratic Members of those committees, would be in control of the commit-

tees. Therefore, Mr. President, the present situation is that there are two committees which the Republicans in the Senate cannot control. That is the only reason why the present action has been taken.

I certainly disown any idea of vengeance or punishment, so far as I am concerned. I only say that if we cannot control two committees, by reason of the present situation, it seemed to me or to the Republican conference, at least, that the only thing we could do was to lose control of the two least important committees in the Senate. That is the only reason why the assignment position of the distinguished Senator from Oregon is as it now is. We left vacancies on those two committees; we have not appointed a majority of Republican Senators to the Committee on the District of Columbia or to the Committee on Public Works. We have appointed a minority of Republicans to those two committees. As I have said, I do not know any alternative.

I would not have objected to the motion which the distinguished Senator from Oregon says he would like to make, namely, that two additional Senators be added, one of whom may be a Republican and one of whom may be himself. But if that is going to be done, I do not think we can hold up the appointment of committees while it is done. I suggest that such a resolution be submitted and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that serious consideration be given to the problem.

I have been very much interested in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I shall not be chairman of that committee, but I shall still be a member of it. So far as I am concerned, if that committee were organized with eight Republican members, six Democratic members, and the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I would be delighted to have him serve on the committee. I do not raise the objection on that point.

The same thing is true, I believe, of the Committee on Armed Services. But I do not see what choice we have under the present circumstances.

I do not think there is any inherent right of the Senator from Oregon not to be "bumped" off of committees. A number of Democratic Senators are being "bumped" off of committees today, under the rules. The distinguished Senator from Oregon claims some right because he was on those committees; but he was on them as a Republican Senator. He was not on those committees as an independent. If he has started a third party and if now he asks assignment as a member of a third party, I cannot see what seniority as a Republican Senator has to do with the question of where as a minority party member he shall be assigned, or that any constitutional question is involved or that there is any reflection on the distinguished Senator from Oregon. He simply faces a condition of the rules under which there seems to be no choice except for us to say, "Very well, if there is not to be Republican control of all the committees, then we are going to vacate control of the two least important committees in the Senate." That is the whole case here, Mr. President.

We have not proposed committee assignments for the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon. We have undertaken to propose appointment of a majority of Republican Senators to the 13 most important committees of the Senate. Thirteen of the standing committees are the most to which we could assign a majority of Republican Senators.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Would not the distinguished majority leader say, as well, that we recommended assignments to committees until we ran out of requests, and the two vacancies are those for which we had no requests?

Mr. TAFT. That is essentially the condition.

Mr. CASE. Yes. Would not the distinguished Senator from Ohio also say that under the seniority principle where there was on a committee a vacancy that was available to the Republicans, it was only natural to make the assignment within the requests available?

Mr. TAFT. I think that was really our duty to those who are members of the Republican Party.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in view of the discussion which has come up in reference to the mechanics of the committee situation, I should like to make one or two observations. I do so pursuant to the studies which it became necessary for me to make when I was asked by the chairman of the Republican conference to serve as chairman of a special committee on the size and numbers of committees.

One does not deal with that problem very long before he recognizes that there is a certain tyranny in numbers, and that when there is an odd number of committees and an odd number of assignments to each committee, it becomes mathematically impossible, in view of the existing limitations, to arrive at a situation where an extra single Senator can be assigned to any given committee; that is to say, it becomes mathematically impossible to assign an additional Member who is an independent to a committee unless an additional majority member is assigned to that committee, for otherwise the possibility of majority control would be destroyed.

The reform the Senate adopted the other day when it adopted the amendment to the rule regarding the size and number of committees will, in my judgment, go down as one of the most important reforms that have been made in the organization of the Senate.

When we had 15 committees, the Appropriations Committee with 21 members, and 14 other committees of 13 members each, the workload was presumed to be about the same for all 14 of those other committees. However, practice and experience have demonstrated that the workload on some committees is greater than that on other committees. That was particularly noticeable, perhaps, in the case of the Committee on the Judiciary, which was

reporting more than half of the bills acted upon by the Senate.

We had 13 members assigned to the Committee on Foreign Relations to handle relations with the world; we also had 13 members assigned to the Committee on the District of Columbia to handle affairs of only the Capital. We had 13 members assigned to the committee charged with the housekeeping of the Nation—namely, the Committee on Finance; and we had 13 members assigned to the committee charged with the housekeeping of the Senate; namely, the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Operation under that rule, when there was a fairly close-party division of the membership of the Senate, and particularly when a large number of new Members came to the Senate, was difficult for a minority party. It was difficult 2 years ago when a number of new Senators came in on the Republican side. It was difficult this time—perhaps even more so, in fact—when the Democratic side, with a loss of two members, lost control of the committees, and had to lose not merely those two positions, but also the 11 committee assignments to which they had been entitled under the Reorganization Act, under which 11 members could serve on a third standing committee.

The change in the rule which we recommended the other day and which the Senate adopted—whereby certain committees were increased by two members, to the extent of a total of nine committees, being the Appropriations Committee and eight other standing committees—created 18 new positions in committees in which there were most requests for assignments. Two committees were left as they are at 13 members. Two committees were reduced by two members each. Two committees were reduced by four members each. These changes, coupled with the change in the rule, whereby not merely 11 but 14 members of the majority might serve on a third committee, along with three additional minority members, preserved the old 11-member margin or difference for the majority, but did make possible the assignment of 18 more Senators on the desired committees and 12 fewer assignments to committees for which there were fewer requests. The difference of 6—between the 12 decreases and the 18 increases—was accomplished by permitting the three additional majority members and 3 minority members to serve on a third committee.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon in his remarks this afternoon has used the word "discipline." In the deliberations of the committee on the size and number of committees, a special committee within the Republican conference, and in the deliberations of the committee on committees of the Republican conference, the word "discipline" was never used within my hearing. The final action of the Republican conference, as has been indicated by both the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Ohio, was simply taking the statement of the Senator from Oregon at his word the other day when he said that he did not desire an assignment by the Republican caucus or the Republican

conference. He said that on the floor January 7, so the Republican conference did not presume to give him an assignment. But after following his request in that respect, the Republican conference found that it could not then refuse assignments to complete the Republican quota for the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor, when there were Republicans who had asked for those committees, and who were entitled under their seniority to ask for those assignments. So that all that happened was that finally there were two spots left, one on Public Works and one on District of Columbia, for which there were no requests. That is the situation which confronts the Senate today.

The suggestion by the Senator from Oregon that he hopes at some time to propose an increase in the membership of those two particular committees, by permitting the majority to add a member and permitting a second minority, the independent, also to add a member, is a matter which may have considerable merit.

As a matter of fact, that would have been accomplished, had the first proposal of the committee on size and numbers of the committees been accepted. That was the proposal, that the majority be permitted to have 18 members on a third committee, the minority to have 3 members. That would have established a difference of 15 between the majority and minority spots.

But we were unable to reach agreement on that, as the distinguished Senator from Ohio has said, so that we had to revert to the 14 majority and 3 minority, maintaining the old 11 marginal difference between the two. That is a technical situation that can be considered, and I think it would be a legitimate subject for the Senator from Oregon to propose and for the Senate to consider at an appropriate time. But as of today, under the rule which the Senate adopted the other day, there was nothing that could be done except to respect the request of the Senator from Oregon that he not be assigned by the Republican conference. Consequently, that was the final action taken. He was not assigned or recommended for assignment by the Republican conference.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I want to make a few replies to the Senator from Ohio and to the Senator from South Dakota. The Senator from Ohio pointed out that as he sees it the Republican Senators had no choice but to follow the course of action they followed. I shall give him another choice before the afternoon is over, and he will have to decide on the merits of the two respective choices.

He points out in the second place that other Members of the Senate are being bumped from committees by this report. But by that argument, Mr. President, he fails to recognize the difference between my seniority rights as a Senator and the seniority rights of a committee member. The only bumping that can be justified under the rules of seniority is bumping the low man on a committee when an election changes the majority control of the Senate from one party to another. However, my case is not that kind of a

case. My case rests upon my 8 years of seniority in the Senate. The Senator from Ohio is referring to another type of seniority and to the long established precedent that the policy has been to eliminate from committees the members of the committees who have low committee seniority.

There is no objection to that. That is a problem of committee seniority within a party. I would expect that by the Republicans to Republicans and by the Democrats to Democrats. The Democrats cannot all stay on the committees after the majority has changed.

But I would remind the Senator from Ohio of the important fact which distinguishes my case from the cases that he has cited. The matter being dealt with here is that of replacement of a minority Member of the Senate on committees to which he has 8 years of seniority. What seniority is going to control so far as that minority Member is concerned? By simply saying there is no other choice it is impossible to wash away the fact that this given minority Member has 8 years of seniority in the Senate of the United States. It is impossible to wash away the fact that, save and except for the one precedent I suggested, involving Sumner, the Senate, in its 157 years of history, has not removed from a committee a Member of this body when he has asked to retain his membership on the committee. All the Senate needs to do is to respect my seniority rights as a Senator if it is to keep faith with the historical precedents of the Senate.

Then I would make the point—and in this respect I certainly agree with the Senator from Ohio, and I have said so from the beginning of this controversy—that I think the majority ought to be placed in a position where it has full responsibility for committee actions; which means they must be given a majority on the committees.

Let us take a look at the Armed Services Committee for a moment, and its record. There are on the floor, several members of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I see no others present at this time, except the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who, at least until this moment, is a member of the Armed Services Committee. I am perfectly willing to say in their presence as my witnesses that I do not think they can cite a single vote in the Armed Services Committee, since the junior Senator from Oregon has been a member, that can be classified in the slightest degree whatever as a party-line vote. When we have walked into the Armed Services Committee, we have parked all partisanship at the door, because as 13 men we have always been aware of the great peril that confronts our country, and in my judgment, that peril is greater at this hour than it has been at any time since the close of the military hostilities of World War II. In 41 of the reports of the Johnson subcommittee of the Armed Service Committee—and they are all the committee reports we have submitted—the members of the subcommittee of which it has been my

honor to be a member, have been unanimous. Never have we submitted a report, Mr. President, which has not been unanimous. An effort may be made by a process of rationalization, to leave the impression that the position of the junior Senator from Oregon on the Armed Services Committee endangers the control of that committee by the Republicans. There is no basis in reality for that fear because so long as I am on that committee I shall continue as I have in the past, to approach each and every problem of that committee, in view of the great peril which confronts our country, as a nonpartisan, as I believe all Democratic and all Republican members of the committee have done. Let us not make a great issue out of a mere matter of form.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield in one second. So far as the Armed Services Committee is concerned, Mr. President, I submit it is an argument of form and not of substance to argue that if the junior Senator from Oregon is left on the Armed Services Committee, the Republican majority control of that committee will be jeopardized.

I now yield to the junior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I feel that I would be remiss if I did not state that I know that what the Senator from Oregon is saying is true. Having been chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, which worked practically around the clock during the closing days of the previous session of the Congress, I know of the long hours the Senator from Oregon devoted to that subcommittee. He is one of the best experts in America as to what our defense bases cost.

I was with the Senator from Oregon on a trip during which we inspected a great number of military bases. We spent approximately 6 weeks working on the problem. Last year we reduced the authorization for those bases approximately 30 percent without affecting the ability of the Nation to defend itself one bit. We ascertained where reductions could be made without imperiling defense or reducing our ability to fight, and at the same time made it possible to spend our money in a way which would give our Nation a better defense program.

I very much regret leaving the Committee on Armed Services, although I have always had an ambition to be on the Committee on Finance. I know that the Senator from Oregon has given very great service to the Nation on the Committee on Armed Services, and it would be a loss to the Nation to be deprived of the services of the junior Senator from Oregon on that committee. I hope something can be worked out so that the Senator will continue to serve on that committee and give the Nation the benefit of the long study we made last year with regard to the costs of all defense bases, involving the expenditure of billions of dollars. Personally, Mr. President, I am convinced that perhaps

billions of dollars can be saved without in any way reducing the ability of the Nation to fight, if sufficient effort is made to reduce the amounts requested.

The Senator from Oregon has given a great amount of study to the subject, and I hope he will continue as a member of the committee.

I might say, Mr. President, that the committee voted to reduce the amount of money being authorized for almost every defense base in America on an average of approximately three and one-half million dollars for each base last year. The vote was unanimous on every occasion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will say that I would be very much less than human if I did not appreciate very much the kind words of the Senator from Louisiana. He is well aware of my very high opinion of the great work he has done as chairman of the subcommittee. I desire on this occasion to extend to him my sincere thanks for the expression of confidence in me which he has just made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words regarding the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It is true that the distinguished majority leader and the junior Senator from Oregon have not agreed on all phases of the Taft-Hartley Act, but what is not generally known by the public is that the Senator from Ohio and I are in agreement in principle on more proposals for amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act than we are in disagreement.

In 1949 the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] held a series of personal conferences with the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] and myself. My recollection—subject to correction, but I think it is an accurate time bracket—is that those consultations continued, off and on, over a period of approximately 10 days. We reached many agreements in principle on what the amendments to the Taft-Hartley law should be in 1949—

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It is not quite correct to say that the conferences were personal conferences. They were meetings of all the Republican members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, including the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], and myself. At that time the Senator was conferring as a Republican, trying to reach a Republican program upon which we could all agree.

Mr. MORSE. We were trying to reach a public program, not a Republican program. There is quite a difference.

Mr. TAFT. It was, however, a caucus of the Republican members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. I am willing to accept that correction, but with one modification, because I want to help the Senator refresh his memory a bit. I think he will recall also that there were some instances in which private conversations were held between the Senator from New York, the Senator from Ohio, and the Senator from Oregon, as to what position we would take when the matter reached the floor of the Senate.

I can recall distinctly one conference among others, in the cloakroom, when I said to the Senator from New York and the Senator from Ohio that I agreed with many of the proposals for amendment which the Senator from Ohio was suggesting, but I did not want to go along with the package proposal, because, as the Senator will recall, the great difference which existed between us was a difference over the direction that amendments to the injunction issue and the secondary boycott issue should take.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I well recall some of the things which occurred in 1949, and I should like to ask my distinguished colleague from Oregon a question.

Does he really think that as an independent, no longer affiliated with the Republican Party or the Democratic Party, he should be a swing man, in a position where, by his one vote, he could decide questions as between the two parties?

Mr. MORSE. That is just the point I am about to discuss.

Mr. IVES. I wish the Senator would discuss it, because if that is his position, I do not agree with him.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to discuss it, because the question itself, Mr. President, shows a political emphasis which I do not share. The question put by the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] implies that when we sit in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare we are motivated by partisan considerations; that we are going to place partisan considerations first, and are going to think in terms of whether we are going to swing one partisan way or the other in the committee.

I submit most respectfully, Mr. President, that only one principle should guide us on that committee or on any other committee, and that is the principle of what happens to be the merits of the issue before the committee from the standpoint of the welfare of the country. That is the issue, and that is the only issue the Senator from Oregon has ever voted on in committee or will ever vote on in committee. The Senator from New York has been a distinguished and exceedingly able and valuable member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I have never known the Senator from New York to cast any vote because of a partisan interest. If I continue on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by a vote of the Senate, I shall continue in exactly the same attitude that has characterized my work on that committee for 8 years.

I think the Senator from New York knows that full well, and he knows that deep conviction of the junior Senator from Oregon, and that is that a party label is not going to be a determining factor in his voting on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare one way or the other on the merits of any issue. He will vote in accordance with what he thinks is right. I know that is what the Senator from New York himself does on that committee.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Senator from New York would like to point out that he appreciates what the distinguished Senator from Oregon has just said about him. I have always tried to vote on that particular committee and at all other times in accordance with what I believed to be for the best welfare of the United States. But let it be understood that the Senator from New York at no time has or will ever set himself up as the one who decides finally as to what is best for the United States of America. The Senator from New York is inclined to yield to the majority when it finally insists on its way—sometimes with reluctance, but always with the feeling that the majority should have its way.

The Senator from Oregon is apparently attempting to put himself between the two sides which are to be divided equally, to determine, himself, what is best for the United States of America, assuming the two sides happen to be in disagreement.

That is where I disagree with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say most respectfully, in reply to my good friend, the Senator from New York, that the attitude which he accredits to me or with which he charges me, if I am allowed to retain my membership on that committee, is a figment of his own imagination. It has no basis in fact whatsoever.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield when I finish my statement.

It has no bearing in fact whatsoever on the attitude of the Senator from Oregon on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, if he is allowed to retain his membership. The Senator from Oregon on the Labor Committee, will continue to cast his votes on the merits of issues, giving great weight, as he frequently has in the Labor Committee—many times controlling weight—to the will of the majority of that committee, by saying, as the records of the committee will show many times, "I am going to yield to the judgment of a majority of my colleagues on this committee, because I must be wrong; I do not have an answer to some of the points that have been made in this debate."

Mr. President, whenever I am satisfied that there is a doubt as to the merits of an issue, one—but, mark you, one—of the factors to which I give great weight in reaching my own final conclusion on an issue is the position taken by the majority, irrespective of what party alignments may be represented by the majority. In the matter of the control of the Labor Committee, many times the majority has been comprised of Democrats and Republicans. It has been a combined majority; it has not been a majority of Democrats or a majority of Republicans.

I shall continue to act as I have in the past. But I may say to my good friend, the Senator from New York, that I do not accept his analysis of what my mental attitude will be on the Labor Committee if I am assigned to the committee by the entire Senate. His at-

tempt to picture me as one who seeks to impose his will upon an otherwise majority by functioning as a swing man or censor of the majority is a status of his imagination.

I have never voted in the past, and I shall never vote in the future, so as to place my judgment as to what the public interest may be above the judgment of everyone else on the committee. In reaching my judgment I shall consider the judgment of other Senators. But as soon as the whole case has ended, as we lawyers say, then I have the responsibility to render my own honest judgment as to where the merits lie. When we come to that, no partisan issue is ever consciously, knowingly, or intentionally going to control the junior Senator from Oregon.

I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Assuming that all the Senator from Oregon says is true—and for the sake of argument I will assume it to be true, so far as his own attitude is concerned—and understanding that he believes the majority in the Senate should control committees, does the Senator from Oregon think that he himself should be placed in a position where he, in turn, in the final analysis, may, under certain circumstances, control the activities of a committee as between the two major parties?

In this particular instance, I am not talking about combinations of Democrats and Republicans, which frequently occur in all committees, and frequently occur in the Senate Chamber. I am talking about committee responsibility and party responsibility in any set-up wherein he himself is the odd number as between those who are members of the committee in the two-party system.

For instance, there are 13 members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Six would be Republicans, and six would be Democrats. The Senator from Oregon would be the deciding factor in any party issue that might arise. Does the Senator, believing in party responsibility, as he himself says he does, think he should be placed in a position in which he personally would make the decision as between the two parties?

Mr. MORSE. I have already answered the Senator's question.

Mr. IVES. No; the Senator has not.

Mr. MORSE. I have answered the question several times this afternoon, but I will answer it again for the benefit of the Senator from New York and other Senators.

It is my position that it would be a great mistake for the Senate this afternoon, under the Reorganization Act, to establish for the first time a precedent whereby a Senator would be removed from a committee without his consent, simply because he has become a member of a minority party. Under the Reorganization Act he is entitled to assignment to two committees, and, in my judgment, fairness and equity entitle a minority member, under the provisions of that act, to retain his present committee assignments, under his seniority rights as a Senator, without being transferred to any other committee, on the basis of any such argument as the Senator from New York has advanced,

which, reduced to its essence, is an argument of partisanship.

If the Senate wishes to act on the basis of partisanship, the doors are wide open for the Senator from New York to follow a course of action which I think should have been followed in bringing in the report this afternoon, namely, so to enlarge, by motion, the membership of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that the particular procedural problem the Senator discusses would not have been created.

In essence, so far as debate techniques are concerned, the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] is attempting to maneuver me into a position of taking responsibility for the failure of the Republicans to come before the Senate today with a committee proposal that would protect the rights of all minority party members. It is the Republicans who in the first instance should have submitted a motion to enlarge the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare by adding another Republican to each one of them so that a minority Member of the Senate, who has seniority rights in the Senate, could have his seniority rights protected. The Senator from New York is trying to maneuver me into the position of saying that procedurally there is nothing else the Republicans could do than what they have done.

There is much they can do, Mr. President. In a few moments I am going to give them an opportunity to do something else. I am going to give them an opportunity to vote for my motion to enlarge the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Armed Services by one Republican, so that the minority Member, who is now making the argument, can retain his seniority rights in the Senate by continuing, as other Senators have continued in the past, with one exception—Sumner, back in the time of Grant—to serve on his committees.

Mr. Ives and Mr. Knowland addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. Ives. I should like to point out my understanding that the leadership of the Republican Party—I stand to be corrected by the Senator from California, who just rose—made every effort to persuade Senators of the Democratic Party to go along with exactly the kind of increase in committee membership to which the Senator from Oregon now refers.

I wish to have it definitely understood that, so far as I know, the Republican Members of the Senate are not responsible for this impasse. It is one that has been thrust upon us by conditions outside of our control or that of the minority leader.

I wonder if the Senator would be willing to yield for the purpose of a unanimous-consent request that such an amendment be adopted, and the committees be increased here and now be-

fore the committee membership question is finally decided?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, since my name has been mentioned—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas permit me to continue to answer the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] for the sake of continuity in the Record? Then I shall be glad to yield.

The fact that the Senator from New York has asserted that the Republicans have done everything they could does not make it so. The fact still is that the Republicans have not brought to the floor of the Senate a resolution or motion to enlarge the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare, and such action will not be taken here this afternoon in the absence of such a motion.

I am perfectly willing to make a motion, but I respectfully submit that, as a minority Member of the Senate, I do not think I should be the one to be placed in the position of submitting a resolution to do what I think, in fair play, the majority ought to be doing in order to protect the minority Member I am talking about. It is the majority that ought to be bringing in the resolution or the motion, not the junior Senator from Oregon. I shall make such a motion in due course, and I hope I may have a record vote on it, because I have no intention of prolonging this debate ad infinitum.

I think I have made my points, but I wish the Record clearly to show that I do not accept the premises of the Senator from New York; I do not accept the premises of the Senator from Ohio; and I do not accept the premises of the Senator from South Dakota. I will dismiss the comment of the Senator from South Dakota merely by saying that it is not necessary to use the word "discipline" in discussions in party caucuses for every one present to know that discipline is being applied. The Senate can take judicial notice of that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] regarding the diligent, patriotic, and nonpartisan manner in which the junior Senator from Oregon has functioned as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. No member of that committee has made a finer contribution to the work of the full committee and that of the preparedness subcommittee than that of the Senator from Oregon.

In regard to the suggestion of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] I should like to say that we are not about to agree to any unanimous consent request to increase the membership of the committee on the floor of the Senate, without consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration. We are not about to agree to any proposal to increase the membership of the

committee by one Republican and one recent Republican. I am amazed that the Senator from New York should make such a suggestion.

We in the minority are operating with 47 Members. We have the same percentage of committee assignments that the Republicans had with 47 Members. In the apportionment of the total committee assignments, the Senate agreed a few days ago that the majority should have sufficient committee assignments to permit two standing committees for each of 49 Senators, and in addition thereto 14 further assignments, so that certain Senators could serve on a third committee.

In the amendment adopted by the Senate the minority was given two standing committee assignments for each of its 47 Members, and in addition three assignments permitting certain Senators to sit on a third committee.

As previously stated—although I believe the statement was challenged—I am informed by Senate aides that it has been the traditional obligation of the majority to assign members of a party other than the two major parties. Because of the obligation and responsibility to which I have referred, the minority agreed the other day that sufficient positions should be provided so that the majority would have assignments on two standing committees for each of 49 Members.

I have great respect for the Senator from Oregon and for his service to his country and to this body. As I say, his work on our full committee and our subcommittee has been of extremely high quality. He has been very patriotic. Moreover, I have a personal feeling for him. But, Mr. President, this is a situation in which a division must take place.

I have been given my allotment, my share of assignments, to distribute among Senators for whom I speak. The majority has been given assignments on two standing committees for each of 49 Senators. I might have been a little presumptuous, but I expressed the hope that the Senator from Oregon could continue to serve on the two committees on which he had rendered outstanding service. However, that was merely a hope, because it was none of the business of the minority to tell the majority how to assign its members to committees, and we do not propose to do so. I do not propose to start adding to committees here and there without proper consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration. The majority has certain assignments to make, and if it has not made them, I do not want it to be indicated on this floor that it is through some fault of the minority.

Mr. Knowland and Mr. Anderson addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hoey in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from California. Then I shall yield to the Senator from New Mexico, following which I wish to reply to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. Knowland. Mr. President, in the first place I think the Senator from

Oregon is mistaken when he says that the statement made by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] was based upon partisanship. I did not so interpret it. I think it was based upon party responsibility, which is an entirely different thing. Of course, we do have the two-party system.

The Senator from Oregon has correctly pointed out that this situation is unprecedented. It is perhaps unparalleled in the history of the Senate. The action which was taken was taken at the instigation of the junior Senator from Oregon himself. He publicly declared that he was no longer a member of the Republican Party. He publicly declared that he did not intend to participate in the Republican conference, which he had an absolute right to do.

Furthermore, he made a speech on the floor of the Senate which has been quoted by the majority leader, in which he stated that he did not want the majority conference to make the committee assignments.

With all due respect to the Senator from Oregon, I think he is quite wrong in his analysis of the situation with respect to seniority in the Senate. So far as committees are concerned, he has no seniority that he does not get from membership in the party to which he belongs. His entire movement in the committees of the Senate is up the ladder of party seniority, depending on which side of the table he happens to sit.

By the action of the distinguished Senator from Oregon himself he took himself out of the line of seniority in the Republican Party and made himself the most senior independent in the Senate, and the most junior independent in the Senate. Despite the fact that he intends to discount the statement of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I think the distinguished Senator from South Dakota is quite correct and quite sound in pointing out to the Senate the mechanics of the Reorganization Act and the mathematical problems faced by the committee on committees and the other committee which the Senator from South Dakota headed.

I point out that the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] was quite correct when he stated that the Republican majority had endeavored to obtain a change in the rules which would have permitted the majority to control all the committees of the Senate. That question was submitted to the minority. After all, the minority on the other side of the aisle is a great minority. Under the rules of the Senate, whether the Senate be considered as a continuing body or as a new body, the Members of the minority are not compelled to accept the dictum of the majority and make a blank-check endorsement of any suggestion which we might make with respect to changes in the rules.

We offered to negotiate with the minority. In their judgment they made a decision which they felt was sound from their point of view; and it may have been sound from the point of view of the entire Senate.

I think the attitude which has been taken by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr.

JOHNSON], for whom I hold a very high regard, is entirely sound. The Members of the minority have had this question before them for consideration. They have negotiated within their policy committee. They have discussed the question with the steering committee. They have undoubtedly discussed it with other Members on the other side of the aisle. Finally they said to us, in effect, "This is as far as we feel we can reasonably be asked to go." We could not even have made the change which we did make without the cooperation of Senators on the other side of the aisle. The rules were slightly modified.

Finally, the majority is faced with the problem of the seniority of Members, even though they may have entered the Senate only a few days ago, who have requested assignments to what are generally considered to be the more important committees of the Senate. I do not discount the importance of the other two committees to which reference has been made, because the District of Columbia Committee has some important problems to consider. It has a great history. It is entitled to high-grade consideration of its problems, and I know that those problems will receive such consideration under the chairmanship of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and other members of the committee who will serve with him, both members from the Democratic side and members from the Republican side.

But the cold, hard fact of the matter is that the majority was entitled to assign its membership to committees based on Republican seniority. What does that leave as a mathematical situation? It leaves two unassigned committee places. One of the places is on the Committee on the District of Columbia; the other is on the Committee on Public Works. As the most senior member of an independent party, as well as the most junior member in seniority of the independent party, those two places fall to the Senator from Oregon. All that the Reorganization Act says is that each Senator shall serve on two committees. The provisions of the Reorganization Act will be carried out when the junior Senator from Oregon serves on those two committees. I repeat that that was not done primarily by action of the Republican Party itself, but was based on the statement of the junior Senator from Oregon, to the effect that he had read himself out of the party and wanted no assignment as a Republican and did not even want the Republican conference to make an assignment.

Mr. MORSE. I yield now to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I was wondering whether the Senator from Oregon had reviewed any of the precedents. I call to mind the election of 1944, and I believe I saw in the Senate Chamber a few moments ago the former distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Ball, who supported the Democratic candidate for the presidency in the 1944 election. Does the Senator from Oregon recall any disciplinary action that was taken at that time?

Mr. MORSE. I discussed the Ball case. I also pointed out, in the case of the so-called insurgents, that those Sen-

ators did not resign from the Republican Party, and therefore their cases are not on all fours with the case of the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. ANDERSON. In the election of 1932 I recall that the Republican Senator from my own State, Mr. Cutting, fairly openly supported Mr. Roosevelt, and thereafter was identified with a great many proposals of President Roosevelt, which he supported. I am wondering if there has ever been a case in which a Senator has been disciplined because he decided to move away from his party, so to speak.

Mr. MORSE. I referred to the Ball case in my speech. I may summarize my speech at this point by saying that whether or not the element of discipline is present in this instance, the fact remains that the proposal before the Senate today is a very singular one with regard to the disposition of the position of the Senator from Oregon on committees.

Let me briefly reply to the Senator from California, because in his argument he left open a very wide barn door, through which all of his horses have escaped. The Senator from California does not discuss the fact that it was within the power and prerogative of the majority to bring forth a resolution or a motion under the Reorganization Act which would have proposed the kind of committee alignment which I understand the Republicans who have discussed the subject this afternoon believe would be a fair and meritorious one. Certainly I am at a loss to understand why the Republicans should sit back and rely upon the very weak reed of argument advanced by the Senator from California, namely that after all the minority is a very powerful group and the majority just cannot impose its will upon them. The question is whether or not on the merits it would be a sounder organization of committees of the Senate to adopt a proposal to increase the membership of the Armed Services and the Labor and Public Welfare Committees by one majority member and retain the junior Senator from Oregon as a member of a minority party on those two committees.

If the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] had heard my main argument this afternoon he would have heard me say that I make no contention for seniority rights on the committees themselves. I said I took the position that if retained on those committees I expected to go to the foot of the table so far as seniority rights on the committees are concerned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment I will yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Oregon has mentioned my name. I wish to say that I listened to the entire speech of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. If he listened to my entire speech apparently he missed that part of it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I heard it, but I do not believe it changes the statement which I made on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I am coming to the second part. What the Senator from California has completely overlooked—and I am willing to let the RECORD speak for itself—is the action of the Senate in Congresses gone by with respect to the disposition or disciplining of Senators who have become members of a minority party. The fact remains that they have not been removed from committees. Therefore, when the Senator from California talks about party responsibility, I believe it was the clear responsibility of the Republican Party this afternoon to bring to the Senate a motion—which I infer they do not believe to be a bad motion at all—that the size of those two committees be increased by one member of the majority party and that the Senator from Oregon as a minority party member be allowed to remain as a member on those two committees.

I wish to say only one word to my good friend from Texas. Of course, I appreciate his comments with reference to my service on the Committee on Armed Services. However, I respectfully disagree with his conclusion as to what the responsibility of the majority party in the Republican caucus was in connection with assignments to committees. I take the position that it was not for either the Republican caucus or the Democratic caucus to make any assignment of the junior Senator from Oregon, but that under the Reorganization Act it is the responsibility of the full Senate to make the assignment. That is all that I have been pleading for.

I have concluded my main argument, Mr. President. I shall now proceed to make a series of motions.

My first motion, so that we may have it as a matter of record, is this: I move to amend the proposed order now at the desk by adding a member of the majority party to the Committee on Armed Services and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and to add the junior Senator from Oregon to the same committees.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, a motion to amend the order is a motion to amend the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I also understand that 1 day's notice must be given of a motion to amend the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I make the point of order that the motion is out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the Senator from Oregon has been talking a great deal about establishing precedents. If the Senate should establish the precedent which is sought to be established by the Senator from Oregon it would mean that any member of the minority, if he becomes the lowest ranking member of the minority, or of a prospective minority, could prevent being bumped off a committee by merely saying, "I have be-

come an independent. I ask you to increase the size of the committee by one so that I may stay on the committee, and you can put on another majority member to offset me."

If we establish that kind of precedent, committees will be swollen out of all proportion, and it will create a situation which will plague the Senate forever.

Mr. MORSE. I may say that the technique of reducing to the absurd is always interesting in debate for illustrative purposes, but usually very unrealistic. However, if we take the Senator from South Dakota at his word, if a condition should arise so that another Member of the Senate decides to join my party, I say that I will meet him with open arms and welcome him, and that we will fight for his seniority rights as a member of that party.

However, Mr. President, I say that the argument of the Senator from South Dakota is not sufficiently persuasive to evade what I believe is the phase of seniority which he and other Senators must face up to this afternoon. It is that issue of seniority in the Senate, in terms of the history of the Senate, that I do not believe the Senate should ignore.

I did not hear the ruling of the Chair. Am I correct in my understanding that the Chair has sustained the point of order raised by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], as the acting majority leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The Senator from Oregon is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say, Mr. President, so that the RECORD will be clear, that I was fully aware that such a ruling would be made, because I, too, had checked into the parliamentary situation.

I made my motion only for the purpose of serving notice that the motion is on the desk and also, to be very frank about it, for the purpose of strengthening my position in the case of the next motion I shall make, for when we come to vote on my next motion, Mr. President, each Member of this body will know that I have pending at the desk a motion which will go to the Committee on Rules and Administration, I assume. It is a pending motion which will carry out what I understand from some of my Republican friends who have talked to me privately about this matter today is the point of view of a good many Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. Mr. President, the Democratic Members, as well as the Republicans, are not unanimously of the opinion that there should not be this change in the rule if what some of them tell me privately can be relied on, as I know it can be.

So I am assuming now that my motion to add a member of the majority party to the Armed Services Committee and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and that the junior Senator from Oregon also be assigned to those two committees is now officially before the Senate and will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Am I correct in that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Oregon will be read.

The legislative clerk read the motion, as follows:

I move to amend the proposed order by adding a member of the majority party to the Armed Services Committee and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the junior Senator from Oregon to the same committees.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon wishes me to do so, I shall move that the motion be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MORSE. I shall appreciate that very much.

Mr. TAFT. Then, Mr. President, I move that the motion of the Senator from Oregon be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The motion of Mr. MORSE was reduced to writing in the form of a resolution, and the resolution (S. Res. 32), submitted by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. HUMPHREY), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and it is hereby, amended by adding, for the period of the Eighty-third Congress, a member of the majority party to the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare and that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be assigned to service on the same committees.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with that resolution before the Senate, each Senator has due notice that adding me to the Armed Services Committee and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, if he so votes this afternoon, will not necessarily create the dire situation to which the Senator from New York has alluded. If Senators wish to regard committee assignments as a matter of pure party balance, and wish to assume that I would sit on those two committees and would vote there on a pure partisan basis, they will know that at the appropriate time, when the committee reports, that situation can be corrected, if we think a correction is necessary, by having a majority of the Senate vote to add a majority member to each of those two committees.

Therefore I move that the order pending before the Senate at this time be amended by placing the junior Senator from Oregon on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, no order is pending before the Senate. There is before the Senate the nominations to committees to be appointed by the Senate.

I do not know exactly how the motion of the Senator from Oregon could be in order. It seems to me that the Senator from Oregon is free to have himself nominated or to nominate himself as an additional candidate for these committees.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my understanding was, as I checked into the parliamentary situation, that the appropriate motion for me to make when the Senator from Ohio presented what

has been referred to, at least, in discussions with me as the order for assignment to committees, was a motion—and I understood that I would be at liberty to so move—that I be added to the Armed Services Committee; and that I make another motion, when the question of membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was before the Senate, that I be added to that committee.

I suppose that, parliamentarily speaking, my motion should await the motion of the Senator from Ohio, that the Senate proceed to consider the assignments to the Committee on Armed Services. With that understanding and with that motion pending before the Senate, to come up the moment when the Senator from Ohio moves to have the Senate take up assignments to the Committee on Armed Services—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield on that point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It seems to me that the present motion of the Senator from Oregon would, if agreed to, actually increase the number of Senators on the Armed Services Committee, which would be in violation of the rule, or would constitute a change in the rule; and such a motion has already been ruled out of order.

Therefore, the only thing which it seems to me the Senator from Oregon could do at this time would be either to place himself in nomination or to have himself placed in nomination for membership on that committee, in which case, if such action were taken by the Senate, there would be an excess of one member on that committee—a difficulty which the Senate would have to resolve by vote.

Mr. MORSE. That is exactly the effect of the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to state that the motion of the Senator from Oregon is in effect a nomination of himself for assignment to the Committee on Armed Services. If the Chair is correct, the Chair would think that at this time there are 16 nominations for assignment to 2 different committees, 1 of them being the Committee on Armed Services.

Did the Senator from Oregon nominate himself for one committee or for two?

Mr. MORSE. I intend by my motion to place myself in nomination for the Armed Services Committee; and later I intend to make a similar motion for membership on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think I can speed the procedure a little by making the following request: I ask that the proposed membership of the 11 committees as to which there is no difference of opinion—namely, all the committees except the Armed Services Committee, the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Committee on Public Works—be confirmed, by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that now we proceed to consideration of membership on the Armed Services Committee. For that purpose several lists of names have been submitted. I have submitted a list of names, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has submitted a list of names, and the junior Senator from Oregon has submitted a name. Those names are before the Senate. I should like to know by what method the Senate proposes to vote under the rule which provides:

In the appointment of the standing committees, the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then, by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same.

Under that rule I suggest that it would be desirable at this time to select, first, the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I understand there is a group A, which I submitted, made up of the names of eight Senators; and there is a group B, submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], consisting of the names of seven Senators; and there is a group C, consisting of the name of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The question about which I have been puzzled is whether the ballot should be by voice vote, upon the calling of the roll, or by paper ballot. I should like to know what the rule is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that in the past the custom has always been to call the roll. A Senator can vote for one Senator or for as many Senators as he desires, up to the permitted number on the committee.

Mr. TAFT. Then, as I understand, there are now 15 candidates for 14 positions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, 15 candidates for 14 positions.

Mr. TAFT. So, as the roll is called, a Senator who wishes to vote for the names submitted by the majority and the minority groups will vote for group A and group B.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. If any Senator wishes to vote for the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], such Senator will then have to indicate some Senator on the other lists whose name he will omit from his vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a Senator could vote for himself or for the Senator from Oregon and for any 13 other Senators, so as to constitute the total of 14.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have no desire to vote now on reorganization of committees; but I wish to inquire of the Chair whether the motion which has just been made in any way affects or lessens the rights of the junior Senator from Oregon in this matter in connection

with the two committees he has mentioned, namely, the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does not.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Before propounding my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. Of course there are different ways of casting this vote. The way suggested by the Senator from Ohio is one way.

I wish to suggest another way, because I am perfectly aware of the procedural problems which confront me in regard to getting a clear-cut vote on the issue of whether I should be appointed to the Armed Services Committee. If I can get a clear-cut vote on that issue, Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to accept the decision of the Senate. Of course I shall accept it, anyway; but in that case I shall accept the decision with a much better feeling in my heart, for then I shall realize that at least I got a fair "break" in the case of the procedural handling of this matter.

Therefore I respectfully suggest to the Senate that the clearest way of facing the issue which the Senator from Oregon has raised this afternoon is to vote on his motion, first, by roll-call vote, that he be added to the Armed Services Committee. If the Senate so decides by a majority vote, then he should be added to the Armed Services Committee. It is then up to the leaders of the two caucuses to decide what adjustment they want to make in their present committee proposals to the Senate. If they vote against the junior Senator from Oregon on that clear and cleanly drawn issue, that ends the matter.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is my request that the Senate proceed with a roll-call vote on the motion of the junior Senator from Oregon that he be elected under the Reorganization Act as a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object to that proposal. It seems to me it is not at all in accordance with the rule. I think there is a little doubt under the rule as to whether the vote should be by written ballot or by calling the roll, but, since the Parliamentarian has said the custom has been to proceed by calling the roll, I think we should proceed according to the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand correctly that the Senator from Ohio makes a point of order?

Mr. TAFT. It was only a suggestion, Mr. President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise to the point of order that the motion of the Senator from Oregon is not in order, because it would have the effect of increasing the membership of the Armed Services Committee. I think the Senator might be able to get the direct vote he wants if he will move to strike out the name of Senator John Jones and insert the name of Senator WAYNE MORSE, rather than going through the process of voting for 14 names.

I do not know what the precedents of the Senate have been, but I do not believe his motion to add an additional name is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this point the Chair would read from rule XXIV:

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

1. In the appointment of the standing committees, the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then, by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same. A majority of the whole number of votes given shall be necessary to the choice of a chairman of a standing committee, but a plurality of votes shall elect the other members thereof.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. If the point of order is sustained by the Chair, and if then the motion made by the Senator from Ohio comes before the Senate, I should like to inquire how those of us who wish to vote in support of the junior Senator from Oregon can do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the Chair's understanding that there are 14 members yet to be nominated on the Armed Services Committee. There are 15, including the junior Senator from Oregon. The Senator from New York or any other Members of the Senate could vote for any 14 of the 15.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Then it will be necessary, in order to vote to seat the Senator from Oregon on the Armed Services Committee, to designate on the list the Senator whom the voter desires to replace with the Senator from Oregon. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He would eliminate 1 from the 14.

Mr. AIKEN. We may eliminate one from either the Democratic list or the Republican list; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. From either the majority or the minority list.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Inasmuch as we are voting on 14 names, it seems to me that if the suggestion of the distinguished majority leader is to be followed, it should be done by ballot rather than by a yea-and-nay vote. Suppose I wanted to vote for the Senator from Oregon to displace someone else. I would have to put his name down and 13 other names. I suppose that is the reason for the word "ballot" being used in the rule.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am inclined to agree with the distinguished Senator from Washington. I think it would be easier for every Senator to put 14 names down on a piece of paper.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A Senator could vote a straight party ticket in that way. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had risen to make a parliamentary inquiry of the Presiding Officer as to the meaning of the word "ballot." If the framers

of the Reorganization Act meant at the time they presented it to the Senate, and the Senate had meant at the time it passed the act, that in a situation calling for a ballot we would vote by a yea-and-nay vote, the word "ballot" would not have been used. I submit that the word "ballot" as used in the act means that Senators should write out a ballot in accordance with the common meaning of "ballot" in the English language.

Each one of us may take a piece of paper and write on that paper the names of the Senators we think should serve on the Armed Services Committee.

The rule then goes on to provide: "and a plurality of vote shall appoint."

I think that clearly emphasizes that, with the ballots coming to the desk, the membership will be elected on the basis of the plurality of the votes cast.

I respectfully request a ruling from the Chair as to whether it is appropriate for the Senate to proceed by written ballot.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed by secret written ballot.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. IVES. Are we to sit at our desks and write out 14 names? Are we not generally agreed that the 14 names which are already written are the 14 names which should be considered in connection with the nominations? Should not our activities in writing out our ballots be confined to those 14 names and that of the junior Senator from Oregon? Is it not a much more simple process to pass out ballots containing the 14 names already listed in the committee organization proposal which has been distributed, and allow us to scratch out any name and substitute the name of the Senator from Oregon, thereby expediting the process?

If we follow the course suggested by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] we will be here all night.

Mr. ANDERSON. If a plurality of votes is obtained, the language of the rule will be conformed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to inquire whether there is at hand a list of the Senators who have been designated by the majority and the minority.

Mr. TAFT. I have lists prepared covering the majority and minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator a sufficient number for all Senators?

Mr. TAFT. I have a sufficient number. Any Senator who wishes to vote for the distinguished Senator from Oregon will have to cross out a name and write in the name of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. RUSSELL. A parliamentary inquiry. What is the proposal before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico that 14 members of the Armed Services Committee be named by the Senate from the list of 15 who have been nominated,

and that it be done by secret, written ballot.

Mr. MORSE. I respectfully submit that that is not quite accurate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest that that is as the Chair understands it.

Mr. MORSE. I know that to be the fact, but it is my understanding that the Senator from New Mexico made very clear that the selection would be made from the 14 remaining nominees, plus the additional nominee contained in my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there are 15 nominees now on the ballot, and that 14 would be selected from the 15.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] already having been selected as chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since this apparently is a new action now proposed, at least I have never seen this procedure followed in the almost 8 years I have been a Member of the Senate, because there are some Senators absent, obviously, if we are to pass out ballots I wonder whether the roll should not be called, and as the roll is called each Senator deposit his ballot at the desk for the tellers to count. Then there will be no question of each Senator properly voting when his name is called, and no question as to whether he was here to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes the suggestion to be sound. Certainly we do not want any double voting.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am not greatly concerned about the issue on which the ballot is about to be taken, but I desire to put the prediction in the Record that if action is taken here today to vote by secret ballot, the precedent will recur to plague the Senate, and cause unspeakable confusion in the committee assignments in the days to come. If the Senate is ever as nearly equally divided as it is at the present time, composed of Members with different political views within both major parties and equally divided on each side of the aisle, there will be confusion, and the committee system will mean nothing if the committees are chosen by secret ballot, as is proposed. No man can foretell what would be the result of it.

As a Senator I shall vote against the motion, because I do not like to see precedents established which in my opinion would not be conducive to orderly procedure in the Senate. The Senate is no place for secret voting.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator feel that the lists should be given to each Senator, and that he should state the names he desires on the committees?

Mr. RUSSELL. That would be highly preferable to the idea of voting by secret ballot.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a suggestion to the majority leader.

It seems to me that a very simple and practical solution would be to classify the nominations by the majority as group A, and classify the nominations by the minority as group B. That would save voting all the names. Then, when a Senator's name was called, he could indicate whether he wanted to vote for group A or group B, and strike out one if he wanted to vote for the Senator from Oregon. That would save going over the whole list of 14 names when the list came to Senators. It seems to me that would simplify the procedure.

As a substitute for the motion made by the Senator from New Mexico, I move that the roll be called, and that each Senator respond by voting for group A, which would cover the majority nominations, or group B, which would cover the minority nominations, and then have a group C, which would be the Senator from Oregon, with the right to each Senator to substitute, as he may see fit, the name of the Senator from Oregon for some other name.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute motion.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it the suggestion of the Senator that the vote be by ballot, or by roll call? I do not see any objection to Senators voting by secret ballot. I do not know whether anyone is in doubt as to whether I am going to vote for the Senator from Oregon or not, but I do not object to a secret ballot, and I do not see why anyone else should object. Senators have a right to vote secretly. The rule says "ballot." It does not say "roll call." I intend to vote for the Senator from Oregon. I do not wish to have any misunderstanding about that. I am willing to take the responsibility for that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I sympathize with the views of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I do not know of anything that should be voted on secretly in the Senate. I dislike the idea of creating a precedent to vote by secret ballot on any question. I think it would be a rather unfortunate precedent. So I agree with the Senator, and I should be glad to second the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina that as a Senator's name is called, then a Senator may respond to group A, or group B, or vote for whomever he desires to vote for. He himself makes the record, and whether he votes for group A or group B, or some Senator by name, is up to each Senator. But I myself join with the Senator from Georgia in his feeling against secrecy in Senate proceedings. I am obliged to agree that I believe taking such action would set an unfortunate precedent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When I said "ballot," I was not thinking in terms of secrecy. I thought the Senators would vote when their names were called.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator want the ballot sent to the desk and have it read?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would be a signed ballot, spread on the Record.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I was about to make the suggestion just urged by the Senator from Washington. Frankly, I do not know what the word "ballot" in the rule means. This is the only place where the word "ballot" is mentioned. In other places the reference is to "roll call."

I also agree with the Senator from Georgia. We do not vote for the President pro tempore in secrecy, and I do not believe we should establish the precedent of voting in secrecy on any question in the Senate of the United States. Therefore, I join with the Senator from Washington in urging that as the roll is called each Senator deposit his ballot at the desk, to be a signed ballot, so that there will be no question as to the responsibility of the Senator in voting, and what his choice is.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator make that as a motion?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let the ballot be spread on the Record.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. It seems to me that complies with the use of the word "ballot," and at the same time does not establish a precedent of secrecy. I should like to make the motion, if I may, that the Senate proceed by roll call to ballot on the Committee on Armed Services, that as each Senator's name is called, he publicly deposit his ballot at the desk, marking it for either the names which have been submitted by the majority or the minority, or, in the event he desires to substitute the name of the Senator from Oregon, he obviously would scratch one name off, so that the number would not be greater than the number of the committee positions; and that the ballot be signed.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that I think that is an exceedingly fair and proper procedure, so far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, although he is a strong defender of the secret ballot in other circumstances.

I quite agree with the Senator from Georgia that in the Senate of the United States we do not use the secret ballot, but here we are on record, and we should transact the public's business on the record.

Although, I may say, very good naturedly, I do not have any doubt in my own mind that I might fare much better under a strictly secret ballot, in my judgment I have no right to ask for a secret ballot, because, as the Senator from Georgia has said, and as the Senator from Ohio has agreed, I believe we ought to protect the procedure of the Senate by having the transaction of business on the record and not in secrecy. I think that is a fair solution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the present occupant of the chair [Mr. HOEY] withdraw his motion, so that the motion of the Senator from California may be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair withdraws the motion he made from the floor, and the substitute motion may now be offered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer my motion as a substitute.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, while I have supported and shall continue to

support the junior Senator from Oregon, I think that, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has stated, we might be creating a precedent that will be very troublesome in the future, and may come back to plague us.

In recognition of the fact that the Republicans are in the majority, and it has always been customary for the majority party to control, it would seem to me that the sound way of caring for this situation would be to increase the membership of the two committees in question so that the Senator from Oregon could still remain a member of those committees, without necessarily affecting the control of the majority party on the committees.

I believe that the wise thing for the Senate to do now is to proceed with the confirmation of all the committees that have been nominated here today, with the exception of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and that the resolution that has been submitted by the Senator from Oregon may go to the Committee on Rules and Administration, in accordance with the rules, to come out after 1 day's notice and be voted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committees have already been approved, other than those in controversy.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think this may become a bad precedent. The Senate can vote to confirm all except these two committees, and the committees that have been confirmed can proceed with their business immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That has already been done.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am afraid that by proceeding to vote on the make-up of the two committees mentioned in the manner before the Senate, we may be setting a bad precedent.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask for a clarification of the situation. As I understand, as the name of each Senator is called, his ballot is to be handed in. If the Senator handing in a ballot chooses to vote for the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], he is to write in the name of Senator MORSE, and is then to scratch out or fail to vote for 1 of the 14 Members who have been named by the majority or minority committees.

Is the ballot then to be signed, and to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that the RECORD tomorrow will show just whom each Member of the Senate was willing to knock off the particular committee involved in order to vote for the Senator from Oregon? Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. In other words, it will be an unhappy day tomorrow.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It was the intention that the ballots would be signed and handed in.

I understand that the Senator from Indiana has a suggestion to make.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the motion of the able Senator from California, which would provide that after the signed ballots have been delivered to the clerk, and when the balloting has been finished, the clerk will read the names

of the Senators and their votes, so that they may become a part of the RECORD. I move to amend the motion to that effect.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is that necessary? The motion provides that the votes shall become a part of the RECORD. Is not that enough, without having to read them all?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. I think they ought to be read. I think the clerk ought to read them, so that they will become a part of the RECORD. I am against secret ballots. I favor making everything public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state for the benefit of the Senator from Indiana that when the ballots are signed and cast, they will become a part of the RECORD.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand. My motion is to amend the motion made by the able Senator from California by providing that the clerk shall read the ballots or the votes of the Senators individually, so that they may be made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I accept the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, and modify my motion to that extent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California who offered a motion, which the Chair will not repeat because it has already been discussed, has accepted the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it is obvious to me by this time that the method set forth in the rules for electing members by ballot is totally impractical. It would seem to me that this matter could readily be settled by a simple motion.

I am sure the Republicans would prefer to select their members and that the Democrats would prefer to select theirs. The only question that would arise would be in case the Senator from Oregon were to become a member of the committee, would his membership be charged to the Democratic side or to the Republican side, or on what basis would the question be settled?

The Senate should determine to which two committees the Senator from Oregon should be assigned. On those two committees there should be an equal division between Republicans and Democrats. I should like to propose that the Senator from Oregon be assigned to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare instead of to the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Public Works.

I realize that under the rules members of committees should be elected by ballot, and my motion might be subject to a point of order, but I hope that no Senator will object, and I am sure we can quickly dispose of the matter if the Senate is prepared to vote on such a motion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield at this point, I suggest that the Senator allow the Senate to proceed in the manner that has been suggested, because, in effect, what the Senator is now suggesting is that the Senate amend its rules at this time.

The rules provide that committees shall be elected by ballot. I think that

if the Senate proceeds in a public way, with no secret ballot, we can expedite the whole matter, we will comply with the rules, and we will not be establishing a dangerous precedent.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is a motion before the Senate. That motion has been modified. It seems to me that we ought to vote on the motion. When the Senate is acting as a committee of the whole, I think it must vote for the whole list. I do not think each side can vote for the particular Senators for whom it wishes to vote.

Under the rules of the Senate, and in the name of common sense, as far as I am concerned, whatever the minority leadership has done, whomever they have nominated, they are going to get my vote. I think they will get the votes of most Republicans. I hope that the minority will feel similarly with respect to voting for the list of Republicans as submitted by the Republican leadership.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to say that the minority conference has selected certain candidates for the places on the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare. The Republican conference has done the same thing. I do not propose to strike from this list any nominee of the minority conference in order to substitute the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

I am sure that whatever privileges I claim for myself I should grant to my fellow Senators. I do not propose to tell the Republicans what Senators they should place on the Committee on Armed Services. They have control of the allotment. They can assign Senators as they choose. But if we select Senators whom we want on the Democratic side, and then inject ourselves into the question of Republican nominees, and select favored Republicans or independents, then, should the Republicans do likewise, the majority soon would be picking every member of every committee in the Senate. I can see no more dangerous day that could ever face a minority.

Mr. President, I think that the majority conference and the minority conference have labored long, thoroughly, and well, and have produced the best nominees for these committees that they could. I propose to vote for the Senators who have been named by the Democratic conference and for the Senators who have been nominated by the conference of the other party. To do anything else would some day result in a bare majority of one dictating every member of every committee on the minority side. I hope that that day may never come.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my good friend from Texas forgets that the independent party has had its caucus. It is unanimously agreed as to the committees on which its membership should belong. The Senator from Texas has not paid any attention, it seems to me, to the rights of that minority party.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Just a moment.

Furthermore, let me say good naturedly, that this minority party finds himself in the position in which no com-

mittee assignment has been made at all, and he does not want either the Republican or Democratic caucus to make the assignment. He is now asking the Senate to make the assignment on the basis of the vote of his caucus. He is asking that his party be represented on the Armed Services Committee and on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in keeping with his 8 years of seniority in the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Chair if the bell for a roll call is now about to be rung?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bell will not be rung until the roll call is ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion until we can act on the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]? Let us settle the method.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I withhold the suggestion of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] as modified. For the information of the Senate, it might be well for the Secretary to state the motion as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The motion of Mr. KNOWLAND, as modified, is that the roll be called and that Senators, as their names are called, submit signed ballots showing the names of 14 Members voted for; and that when the roll call is completed the Secretary read the names.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I should like to see the name of the Senator from Oregon added to the membership of the two committees which have been referred to, but I recognize the fact, as we all do, that no Senator desires to "bump off" any of the Members nominated by the two parties through their authorized committees. As I understand, it has already been agreed by the Senate that the final disposition with regard to the membership of the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will not be made today, save in the event that the Senator from Oregon presses his motion. Am I correct?

Mr. TAFT. No. We are about to vote now on the membership of the Armed Services Committee, and then we shall vote with respect to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and complete action upon all committees.

Mr. LEHMAN. Earlier in the afternoon I asked whether the motion made by the distinguished majority leader would jeopardize or affect the right of the Senator from Oregon to move that the size of those committees be increased by one member. The answer which I believe I received from the distinguished occupant of the chair was that it would not jeopardize or affect the rights of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. TAFT. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Oregon made a motion which was substantially a motion to change the rules. That motion in the form of a resolution was referred—not

with his consent, but without dissent—to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I can assure the Senator from New York that I will at least urge the Committee on Rules and Administration to give serious consideration to that question. However, I am certain that such consideration will require a long period of time, if this case is like most cases involving rules. I do not think we should wait until such a determination can be made. Once that question is taken up for consideration, the Committee on Rules and Administration will have before it many other questions involving committees. So I think we should not wait. I think we should choose the membership of committees and organize the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the distinguished majority leader, there is not much reason for me to pursue the subject. I believe that my suggestion has a very substantial element of soundness in it. I repeat that I do not wish to delay the organization of the committees any longer than is necessary. In the case of 13 of them, their organization does not need to be delayed even for a minute. I wish we could have some assurance that the two motions made by the Senator from Oregon and put in the form of a resolution, and which has now been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, will be promptly reported from that committee, so that it may be before the Senate the next time it convenes. In the meantime the organization of those two committees could be held in abeyance. It seems to me that the suggestion which I have made would take care of the situation in a substantial way and not create precedents which would be unfortunate. I share the view of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that we may be creating precedents which will be serious in their impact and their implications in future years.

I ask that the suggestion which I have made be accepted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE. The ballots which have been distributed carry 15 names now—

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we not vote on the pending motion and settle upon the method we are to follow, and then have a quorum call?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], as modified, which is offered as a substitute for the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I, for one, realize that it is always proper for the party itself to make its nominations; but the Senate cannot avoid its responsibility for the assignment of independent members of this body. I do not know what the practice of the Senate has been. I have not found any case in which independents have been separately assigned. However, I recall that Senator La Follette formed at one time the Progressive Party, which certainly sep-

arated itself from the Republican Party, but there was no change in his committee assignments so far as I have been able to learn.

My only interest is to see to it that hereafter, if there are independent Members of this body, there shall be a method whereby they may be assigned to committees.

I should like to support the motion which the Senator from Oregon made to increase the size of certain committees. I do not like to cast a vote which would substitute the name of someone else for that of a regularly constituted nominee of the party. However, I believe that until we arrive at a method of assigning independent members of this body to committees, we shall not be meeting our responsibility. I understand that to a certain extent the House of Representatives has successfully handled that problem.

It is a well known fact that there was elected from a certain district in New York a Representative in Congress named Marcantonio. There were many members of the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives who did not want the responsibility for assigning Mr. Marcantonio to committees.

However, that was the responsibility of the party, and the majority acted and assigned Mr. Marcantonio to committees.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to insert in the RECORD my judgment that Mr. Marcantonio was never an independent, and never belonged to the party of the junior Senator from Oregon. [Laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not trying to identify him with the party of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I think this is a question which we must meet someday by the assignment of individual Members to committees of their choice. I do not think it would be fair to take away from Republicans the right to have a majority on any committee. Therefore, I hope that someday a rule may be devised which will allow an opportunity for the proper assignment of Senators to committees.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am in the same position as the Senator from New Mexico. I should like to vote to assign the Senator from Oregon to the two committees which have been mentioned. However, I think we are missing the point. The Independents who have been in the Senate or the House have been duly elected under their State laws under the label of a certain party, whereas in this case the rules of the Senate still describe the election of the Senator from Oregon as the election of a Republican.

I do not wish to interfere with Republicans assigning their own members, but I wish there were some rule whereby I could express my opinion that the Senator from Oregon, whether or not he was elected as an independent, should be assigned to those two committees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Has the Senate already selected and elected the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That has already been done, and all members of committees, with the exception of the four which are involved now, have been chosen, one of which is the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My understanding is that we have elected the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, but we have not yet proceeded to elect the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. The Chair was in error as to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The Senate having already chosen, exclusive of the committees which are now under discussion, the chairman and members of such committees, the question is on the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], as a substitute for the motion of the Senator from New Mexico, to proceed to the election by ballot of 14 members of the committees.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I feel an independent streak coming on, Mr. President, and I may want to form an independent party. May I do so at any time I wish?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. It is a political question, which the Chair declines to answer.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], as amended by the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The motion, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Daniel	Hoey
Anderson	Dirksen	Holland
Barrett	Dworshak	Humphrey
Beall	Ferguson	Hunt
Bennett	Flanders	Ives
Bricker	Frear	Jackson
Bridges	George	Jenner
Bush	Gillette	Johnson, Colo.
Butler, Md.	Goldwater	Johnson, Tex.
Butler, Nebr.	Gore	Johnston, S. C.
Capehart	Green	Kefauver
Carlson	Griswold	Kennedy
Case	Hayden	Kerr
Chavez	Hendrickson	Kilgore
Clements	Hennings	Knowland
Cooper	Hickenlooper	Kuchel
Cordon	Hill	Langer

Lehman	Murray	Smith, N. C.
Long	Neely	Sparkman
Magnuson	Pastore	Stennis
Malone	Payne	Taft
Mansfield	Potter	Thye
Martin	Purtell	Tobey
Maybank	Robertson	Watkins
McCarran	Russell	Weiker
McCarthy	Saltonstall	Wiley
Millikin	Schoeppel	Williams
Monroney	Smathers	Young
Morse	Smith, Maine	
Mundt	Smith, N. J.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The Chair is informed that ballots have been distributed.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, Senators may use any form of ballot they wish to use, and they are not restricted to using the ballot which has been distributed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct. The ballots have been distributed as a convenience to the Members of the Senate. The Committee on the District of Columbia has nine members, and each side has placed four members on it. That leaves one vacancy. The Committee on Public Works has 11 members, and each side has placed 5 members on it. That leaves one vacancy. On the Committee on Armed Services there are 15 members. The chairman of the committee having been selected, the vote will be for 14 members, instead of 15. Without any motion to the contrary, the Chair understands that the vacancies will be voted on en masse at one time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that apparently the ballot which has been distributed shows the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as chairman. He has already been elected chairman. I suggest that any Senator who uses the type-written ballot before him should cross out the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] before he casts his ballot.

As I understand, a vote in favor of the ballot as written is a vote for the Republican and Democratic selections A and B, as the distinguished Senator from North Carolina has referred to them. Any Senator who wishes to vote for the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will have to write in the name of the Senator from Oregon if he uses the prepared ballot. Is that correct, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. Any Senator may, on a separate piece of paper, write in all the names of Senators for whom he wishes to vote.

Mr. TAFT. All votes will be read by the clerk; is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The votes of each Senator will be read.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Ohio. He suggested that those of us who wish to use the piece of paper or proposed ballot that has been placed on our desks, strike out the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. Of course, the Senator from Massachusetts has already been elected chairman of the Armed Services Committee. It seems to me that we could ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Massachusetts be ignored by all of us. Then we would not have to go to the trouble of striking out his name.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that if the name of the Senator from Massachusetts is not scratched out, it be ignored, because he is here designated as chairman of the committee, and he has already been elected chairman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is whether the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] shall be scratched out or ignored. [Laughter.]

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The roll will now be called. The Chair assumes that each Senator will send his signed ballot to the desk, to be kept at the desk until all the ballots have been cast, whereupon all of them will be read. The procedure is rather unusual, of course.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. AIKEN, whereupon Mr. AIKEN sent his ballot to the desk, and the Chief Clerk commenced to read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The ballots will not be read until all the ballots have reached the desk.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had understood that the ballot of each Senator would be read at the desk. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes, each Senator's ballot will be read at the desk, at the end of the casting of the ballots.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it seems to me that it will be infinitely simpler to have each ballot read as it is submitted; and I had understood that to be the purpose of the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it was my understanding that that would be the procedure, namely, that as each ballot reached the desk, it would be read at that time, in conformity with my motion and the modification proposed by the Senator from Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood that the proposal of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] was that the names on the ballots not be read until the end of the roll call.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—for I believe it will save time and will simplify the situation—that the names on the ballots be read as the ballots are presented.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, unfortunately I have been carrying a little fever. Dr. Calver tells me that I should go home. May I ask the clemency of the Senate to cast my ballots out of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered; they will be cast out of order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator from Oregon rise?

Mr. MORSE. The Chair has pending a request as I understand, as to whether we should proceed in the way the Senator from California has suggested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair put that question, and the Chair thought the Senator from Vermont was rising to object. However, the Senator from Vermont did not object.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was rising to reserve the right to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon reserves the right to object to the request of the Senator from California.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that if what has now been suggested is the will of the Senate, of course I shall accept it. However, I respectfully suggest that I think the word "ballot" in the rule means something, and I think the fairer procedure would be to have each Member of the Senate submit his ballot when his name is called; and when all the ballots are in, then let us have the results of the ballots read, for if what the Senate had wanted when the Reorganization Act was passed was a straight ye-and-nay vote, I think the rule would have so stated.

I make very clear that I am not asking for a secret ballot, Mr. President; but I believe it is only fair to ask that all the ballots be filled out and placed at the desk and then read. I need not tell my colleagues in the Senate that we are not acting in a vacuum. As the ballots are read, if we follow the procedure suggested by the Senator from California, the result might be somewhat different than it would be if we followed the procedure suggested by me.

So, Mr. President, in keeping with the meaning of the word "ballot," I believe the better interpretation and the fairer procedure would be, after each Senator's name is called, to have him hand to the page boy, for delivery to the clerk at the desk, his ballot; and when all the ballots are in, have them read.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I have stated heretofore, my only interest in this matter is in the precedent that our action will establish. Any action establishing a precedent of secrecy in the administration of the public business has no place in the Senate of the United States. The best way to proceed with the balloting is either to have each Senator rise when his name is called and state the 14 names on his ballot, or else send the ballot to the desk and have the names read at the desk at the time the name of each Senator is called. The word "ballot" has no significance here except to indicate the selection will be by voting. It does not require the use of the Australian ballot.

Any attempt to have the secret ballot apply in the Senate of the United States is, in my opinion, completely out of keeping with the character of the Senate as a public body, as a body composed of representatives of the people who should be sufficiently courageous to stand up and let their every act be known to all the people of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair asks the Senator from California to wait a moment, please.

Let the Chair state that the present occupant of the chair was not in the chair when the motion of the Senator from California was agreed to. The Chair is informed that that motion provided that Senators should send their ballots to the desk, and that the ballots should be read, each one separately, after the roll call is concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not hear such a statement made, or else I would be debating it at this good moment.

The motion I heard made was that the ballot of each Senator be sent to the desk and then be read by the clerk. That is perfectly in keeping with the character of the Senate as a public body composed of representatives of the people.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct; the motion was to have the ballots read at the time when they were cast.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no interest in the question of whether the ballots be read when cast or be read after all the ballots are cast.

Under the usual procedure, the ballots will be read as cast.

Mr. RUSSELL. But, Mr. President, I submit that it is more in keeping with procedure in the Senate for a Senator's ballot to be read when it is cast.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair asks that the motion be read.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the motion was made by me, and I accepted a modification of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair now understands that the Senator from California made the motion and accepted a modification, which the Chair is informed provided that all the ballots be cast and then read.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, Mr. President; I respectfully suggest that certainly that was not my intent in the situation. I was trying to obtain a procedure which would meet the requirement of the ballot under the rule and at the same time not have any degree of secrecy. In working out the procedure, my understanding was that Senators would sign the ballots and would send them to the desk, and then the clerk would read them, and we would proceed with the roll call—in short, that each ballot would be read as it was received at the desk. That was my intent, regardless of whether I made it clear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is that the effect of the modification of the motion?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is my understanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If that is the case, of course that procedure will be carried out.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from California has made a perfectly accurate statement of what certainly was the import and intent of the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

After having listened to the Senator from Georgia, let me say that I believe it is perfectly clear that, at least momentarily, the procedure I first suggested would amount, at least for that period of time, to a secret vote in the Senate of the United States. It is true that whenever there is a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate we hear each Senator state how he votes when his name is called. Of course there is no doubt, Mr. President, that because of our reliance on the judgment of our colleagues, who often serve on committees of which we are not members, and thus are more familiar than we with certain of the measures before us, that we place great reliance on their judgment. Sometimes the explanation of the vote we cast is that we voted on the basis of the best judgment

of certain of our colleagues on the committee concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that under the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], as modified by the suggestion made by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], each Senator's ballot will be read as it is sent to the desk, and in that way the names contained in each ballot will be read as the ballot is received at the desk.

The Secretary will resume the call of the roll; and as each Senator's name is called, he will send his ballot to the desk, and the names contained in the ballot will then be read at the desk.

The legislative clerk again called the name of Mr. AIKEN, and his ballot having been sent to the desk, was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. ANDERSON, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, MORSE, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BARRETT, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BEALL, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BENNETT, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BRICKER, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BRIDGES, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BUSH, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD,

JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BYRD, who was not present.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. CAPEHART, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. CARLSON, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. CASE, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. CHAVEZ, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. CLEMENTS, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. COOPER, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. CORDON, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. DANIEL, whereupon his ballot was

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, MORSE, RUSSELL, BYRD,

BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT,
STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. MURRAY, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. NEELY, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, MORSE, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. PASTORE, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name Mr. PAYNE, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. POTTER, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. PURTELL, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. ROBERTSON, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. RUSSELL, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. SALTONSTALL, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SEMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. SCHOEPPEL, whereupon his ballot

was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. SMATHERS, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mrs. SMITH of Maine, whereupon her ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. SPARKMAN, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. STENNIS, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. SYMINGTON, who was not present.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. TAFT, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. THYE, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. TOBEY, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, MORSE, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

SELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. WATKINS, whereupon his name was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. WELKER, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. WILEY, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. WILLIAMS, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. YOUNG, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] attended the inauguration yesterday of Gov. Phil Donnelly at Jefferson City, Mo., and is therefore necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The balloting has been completed. The Chair wishes to inquire whether there are any Senators who have not cast their ballots. If so, the ballots will be received at this time.

There will be a short delay while the recapitulation of the balloting is being completed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If I should obtain the floor for 2 minutes, would I be interrupting the roll call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest that there be no

interruptions while this particular function is being completed; otherwise there might be confusion.

The tabulation having been completed, the clerk will announce the result.

The legislative clerk announced the result, as follows:

Mr. BRIDGES, 88 votes.
Mr. FLANDERS, 88 votes.
Mrs. SMITH of Maine, 88 votes.
Mr. HENDRICKSON, 88 votes.
Mr. CASE, 88 votes.
Mr. DUFF, 88 votes.
Mr. COOPER, 83 votes.
Mr. RUSSELL, 88 votes.
Mr. BYRD, 88 votes.
Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, 88 votes.
Mr. KEFAUVER, 88 votes.
Mr. HUNT, 88 votes.
Mr. STENNIS, 88 votes.
Mr. SYMINGTON, 86 votes.
Mr. MORSE, 7 votes.

Not voting—8: BYRD, DOUGLAS, DUFF, EASTLAND, ELLENDER, FULBRIGHT, MCCLELLAN, SYMINGTON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The results speak for themselves. The Committee on Armed Services is so constituted.

Does the Senator from Oregon wish to press his motion with respect to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at this time?

Mr. MORSE. I shall make my own announcement, Mr. President.

I am willing to take judicial notice that if we were to proceed to ballot on the same motion with respect to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the result would be either identical or so close to the same result that in my judgment it would be a waste of the time of the Senate for me to press such a motion. Therefore I shall not do so.

I wish to say to my colleagues in the Senate that I accept, with good grace, the decision which has just been rendered. The Members of the Senate will have to live with the precedent they have established with respect to the status of minority parties in the Senate in the future, when a minority party is a party other than one of the two parties to which we refer as the major parties.

Let me say to my good friend from Ohio, the majority leader [Mr. TAFT], that I think, if he agrees with the parliamentary point that I now raise, that it would be very appropriate if a recommendation were made to the Senate in regard to the assignment of the junior Senator from Oregon to committees. I respectfully submit that the report pending at the desk, which does not specifically assign the junior Senator from Oregon to committees, is technically out of order.

I have no intention or desire to raise any technical point. I respectfully suggest that the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in behalf of the Senate, make an assignment, because I do not think it would be wise to leave the record in a situation in which, shall we say, a sort of garbage can principle is applied, the principle that the minority takes what is left.

I shall always discuss these matters above the level of personalities. Irrespective of the persons involved, I respectfully suggest that assignments to committees should be positive, and not

negative. Therefore I suggest to my good friend from Ohio, not in his capacity as the leader of a caucus, but in his capacity as majority leader in the Senate, that he place in nomination the junior Senator from Oregon for assignment to such committees as the Senator from Ohio thinks, under the parliamentary circumstances in which he finds himself, are most appropriate for the junior Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Oregon kindly withhold that suggestion until the membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is agreed to?

Mr. MORSE. I was only making a suggestion. The Chair misunderstood me if he thought I was pressing it as of this moment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in what capacity I do not know, but as a Senator from Ohio I submit the name of WAYNE MORSE to be a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and also a member of the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Public Works—

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, after submitting that name I wish to follow through and ask unanimous consent that all the names of members of the three committees, namely, the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Committee on Public Works, be now approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall be very brief—I wish the RECORD to show that I am not objecting to the parliamentary procedure of considering the nominations made by the Senator from Ohio. I shall vote against the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, on this question I feel that we should accept the judgment of the Senator from Oregon. Earlier this afternoon the Senator from Oregon submitted two resolutions to increase the size of the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. A point of order was made, and those resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I do not know whether the Senator from Oregon will agree with me or not, but it seems to me that until a report has been made by the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Senate has an opportunity to consider the question of increasing the size of those committees so as to include the distinguished Senator from Oregon, we should not dispose of the two committee assignments of the Senator at this moment, unless the Senator from Oregon wishes that to be done. I still very much hope that the resolutions will prevail. I believe they are just, fair, and entirely in accordance with the traditions of our country and of Congress. Therefore I

should like to have the two resolutions brought before the Senate at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. TAFT. Is there objection to my unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon reserves his right to object.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New York. I wish to make my position clear on the parliamentary situation. I do object to being assigned to the Committee on the District of Columbia and to the Committee on Public Works. However, the Senate can vote to assign me to those committees, even though I shall vote against such assignment. In view of the fact that I do have pending before the Senate a motion that the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be enlarged by adding one member of the majority to each of the committees, plus adding the junior Senator from Oregon to such committees, which has been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, I would suggest that I not be assigned to any committee this afternoon. If it will make it helpful to my colleagues I shall make the request as a personal point of privilege that I not be assigned to any committee by the Senate this afternoon.

I have checked the rule and I do not see anything in the rule which would prevent a Member of the Senate from requesting that he not be assigned to a committee and the Senate's abiding by that request until such time as the Committee on Rules and Administration can consider the question of whether there is merit, as the Senator from Oregon contends there is merit, in his motion, that the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be enlarged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon object to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Taft]?

Mr. MORSE. If the unanimous-consent request is that the Senator from Oregon be assigned to the two committees mentioned by the Senator from Ohio, he does object.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I distinctly understood the Senator from Oregon to ask that he be assigned to those committees. That is the only reason why I submitted his name for assignment to the committees. I now withdraw the submission of his name for assignment to those committees.

I wish to point out that the rule requires that every Senator shall serve on two committees. I do not object to temporarily postponing the assignment of the Senator from Oregon, in accordance with his request, but I believe it ought to be clearly understood by the Senate that the rules of the Senate provide that each Senator shall serve on two committees. I believe that if a Senator is assigned to a committee he must serve on such committee.

It seems to me that we could go ahead this afternoon and set up the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on the District of Columbia, with a vacancy

on each of them. That procedure has been followed before. I see no reason why it cannot be done today.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that all Senators whose names have been submitted for membership on the three committees be assigned to those three committees.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the only point that bothers me about this procedure is that I understood the Senator from Oregon earlier to suggest that his assignment to committees be made by the Senate, which I believe is entirely proper procedure. Such assignment should be made by the Senate. However, the Reorganization Act states very clearly that each Senator shall serve on two committees. The rights of the Senator from Oregon, in the event the rule should be changed, if the Senate should so determine, would in no way be jeopardized by his serving on two committees, as required by law.

However, I must strenuously object to what in effect would be a waiver of the Reorganization Act by having the Senator from Oregon not assigned to two committees, as required by law.

Mr. TAFT. I merely made the suggestion that the assignment should be postponed, at the request of the Senator from Oregon. I do not want to insist on it. I do not believe there would be involved any violation of the Reorganization Act by not making the assignment today. I do not believe the Senator from California should press his point if the Senator from Oregon wants to delay action.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to assure the Senator from Ohio that I never wish to have any misunderstanding between us, without its being cleared up immediately, with respect to the accuracy of a statement by me to him or by him to me. I believe he will find, if he checks the RECORD, that I did not ask him to assign me to those two committees. I made the broad suggestion in good faith that I believe the report in its present form needed to be corrected so that it will contain an assignment of me by the Senate to two committees. Such action would then give me the opportunity of making the point that I have made, namely, that I wish to have the matter postponed until further consideration and reflection can be given to it by my colleagues in the Senate in connection with the motion which will be before the Committee on Rules and Administration.

It seems to me to be perfectly clear that so long as there is a possibility that the Senate might follow a different course of action than the one it took this afternoon—and I believe it is a remote possibility, although I am a very hopeful fellow—and until there is finally settled the decision on the motion which I have pending, final action on my committee assignments should not be taken.

I believe the Senator from Ohio is right in his reply to the Senator from California. All I am asking for parliamentarily is a postponement of the assignments as suggested by the Senator from Ohio in his capacity as a Senator.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it should be pointed out in that connection that the problem would not be solved merely

by adding two Members to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Such action would leave us in a situation where the Committee on Public Works would have assigned to it 10 Members—5 Republicans and 5 Democrats. The same situation would hold with respect to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Four Republicans and four Democrats would serve on that committee. In other words, we would leave those committees with an even number of majority and minority Members. If we are to change the set-up and preserve majority control, we must add more than one Member from each side.

Mr. TAFT. I understand.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to participate in the discussion between the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Oregon as to what seems to them to be the parliamentary situation. I wish briefly to state that I resent the idea that the Committee on Public Works is not a fine committee of this body. As a matter of fact, it is the only committee which is nonpolitical. It is the only committee that takes care of floods in Republican Kansas, as it takes care of floods in Democratic Mississippi. Irrespective of personnel, either Republican or Democratic, that committee takes care of mud in Missouri irrespective of politics, as it takes care of mud somewhere in Florida.

I am leaving that committee as chairman. We have had 13 members on it. According to my recollection the membership has been reduced to 11. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] will be the chairman of the committee. Not once, when it came to a question of flood control, a question of building roads, a question of navigation, or a question of rivers and harbors, did the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the former Senator from Washington, Mr. Cain, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], or the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] interfere in any way whatever from a political standpoint. There was not any time either when the Democratic majority acted purely on political grounds. Mr. President, if we wish to keep the committee out of politics let us vote for a Republican committee under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as I stated earlier in the debate, many of us on this side of the aisle would have liked to have voted to place the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon on the two committees on which he formerly served. However the parliamentary situation became such that it was almost impossible for me to vote affirmatively for my good friend the Senator from Oregon without also voting against a Senator whom the Republican caucus had placed on the committee. I do not want yet to put myself in that position. I may not agree with the Republican caucus; but it is their caucus, and they have a right to do what they wish there.

I thought the solution of this problem would be the addition of new members to the Armed Services Committee and

the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Senator from Oregon has submitted a resolution, and it has been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I hope speedy action will be taken by the committee on the resolution. I am in favor of the resolution, and I will vote for it.

At this time, with the permission of the Senator from Oregon, I wish to ask unanimous consent that my name appear on the resolution, as one of its sponsors, when the resolution comes before the Committee on Rules and Administration. I now ask such unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask the same unanimous consent, namely, that I be permitted to have my name included as one of the sponsors of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have been trying to discover, in conversation with some of my colleagues, what we might do to assure rather speedy action by the Committee on Rules and Administration one way or another on the resolution of the Senator from Oregon. I would not suggest what kind of action the committee take; but once a resolution is referred to a committee, it may, for some reason or other, find itself in somewhat difficult straits in regard to finding its way out of committee.

Therefore, with all due respect to the precedents of this body, I move that the Senate instruct the Committee on Rules and Administration to report not later than Thursday the resolution now before it, as submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Minnesota is not in order at the moment, because a unanimous-consent request by the Senator from Oregon is pending, namely, that he not be assigned to any committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I believe the request was a matter of personal privilege by the Senator from Oregon, namely, that he not be assigned to any committee at this time. It was predicated upon the resolution to which I now refer, namely, the resolution which would increase the size of the Armed Services Committee and of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

It is my belief that we wish to expedite action on this matter. I strongly feel that in view of the outstanding service of the Senator from Oregon in this body, he should be placed on these two committees.

I found myself in exactly the same predicament in which the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] found himself, and it was not easy for me to vote in favor of the committee assignments as proposed by the caucus. I wish the Senate at least to have an opportunity to make an honest determination as to whether the Senator from Oregon shall be privileged, as a member of the

minority party—as he has made perfectly clear—to participate as a member of the committees upon which he feels, in view of the precedents of the Senate, he has a right to serve. He has been a member of the Armed Services Committee and a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Today we have honored the precedents of the Senate in the case of the majority and the minority parties. The Senator from Oregon has made his case for his right as an independent Senator to sit on two committees.

Therefore, Mr. President, when there is no other business before the Senate—for there was no objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon that his committee assignments be held in abeyance—I shall move that the Committee on Rules and Administration be instructed by the Senate, as has been done by the Senate in the case of vital legislative proposals, to report the resolutions not later than Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair still insists that the request of the Senator from Oregon must be disposed of before any other matter is considered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me suggest that what is before the Senate at the moment is the appointment of members of committees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has held that the motion of the Senator from Minnesota is not in order. However, the Senator from Oregon has requested that he not be assigned to committees.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Chair has misunderstood me. I only objected to the request of the Senator from Ohio that the appointments to the two committees be made as nominated or suggested by the Senator from Ohio. I said that I would object to that request unless there could be an understanding as to the postponement of my assignment to committees.

Mr. TAFT. And I have so agreed, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. President, let me now modify my request for unanimous consent, by asking unanimous consent that the assignments to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be made as submitted by the majority and minority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Ohio. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire whether that request may be amended by adding a provision regarding action by the Rules and Administration Committee on the resolution now before it, namely, that pertaining to the assignment of the Senator from Oregon to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I think such a provision is germane.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Minnesota object to my request for unanimous consent? My request is not a modification. Unless the 13 proposed members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are appointed by unanimous consent to the committee, we shall have to proceed to elect them. Do we have to elect them? That is what I wish to ascertain.

Already we have confirmed the proposed appointments to 11 committees. We took that action by unanimous consent. Now I am suggesting the same procedure in the present case, if there is no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My point is whether it will be in order to modify the unanimous-consent request by providing that the Committee on Rules and Administration be required to report not later than Thursday the resolution submitted by the Senator from Oregon, pertaining to his appointment to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would not be in order at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the proposed assignments of Members to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as submitted. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Has the chairman of the committee been named?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair supposes that has been included in the order which was submitted.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; it includes both the chairman and all the other members of the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am not objecting to the unanimous-consent request, other than its present form. I believe the matter would be solved if we proceeded with an oral vote on the question of whether we shall elect the proposed members.

Mr. TAFT. I take it that that is an objection to my request, Mr. President.

I then move that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] be elected chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now move that there be elected to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the following 12 additional members: the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the eight members nominated or proposed for membership on the Committee on the District of Columbia, as submitted by the majority and the minority, be elected to that committee, leaving one vacancy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not press my point at this time, let me say that I think unless the period during which there will be a vacancy on the committee is to be a relatively short one, we should not in effect amend the La Follette-Monroney Act by not assigning every Senator to two committees. If the action proposed to be taken is to be taken by unanimous consent, as a matter of courtesy to the Senator from Oregon, so that this matter may be held in abeyance for only a few days, I shall not interpose objection.

On the other hand, if we were to let such an arrangement continue for an extended period of time, in my judgment that would constitute a violation of the Reorganization Act. Certainly the Senate should not proceed to amend that act in such a manner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that the eight Senators proposed for appointment be elected members of the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask whether in this case the chairman of the committee has yet been elected.

Mr. TAFT. The unanimous-consent request covers both the chairman and all other members of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Ohio in the case of the Committee on the District of Columbia?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 10 Senators whose names were submitted as proposed members of the Committee on Public Works be now appointed to that committee, leaving one vacancy on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the request include the chairman of the committee?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; it includes the chairman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey will state it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We have just voted for the membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Is that committee so constituted at this time that I can call a meeting to organize the committee, in order to comply with the request which was sent to me, namely, to have an early meeting to consider the nomination of the Secretary of Labor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey can call a meeting of the committee at any time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I was not clear, in view of the fact that we were awaiting action on the Morse resolution, and the committee was held over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; that would not affect the power or right of

the committee chairman to call the committee together.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to join as a sponsor of the resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Oregon today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I may say the resolution is open for the endorsement of any colleague who wants to join with me in this cause.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent is required for any Senator to add his name to a bill or resolution that has been introduced or submitted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any Member of the Senate who wishes to join in the endorsement of that resolution be allowed to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, one of the large unions of the American Federation of Labor has come out in support of pay raises for Members of the legislative branch of the United States Government. I request unanimous consent to insert at this point in the body of the RECORD a signed editorial from the current issue of the Government Standard. The Government Standard is the voice of the American Federation of Government Employees, an American Federation of Labor affiliate with some 100,000 members in all States and Territories. The editorial is signed by James A. Campbell, president of the American Federation of Government Employees.

It is significant that a labor union should be one of the first to come out urging salary increases for Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT

Do you know that United States Senators and United States Congressmen receive a salary of only \$12,500 a year? Do you realize that this meager salary is a disgrace when you place the duties and responsibilities of a Senator and Congressman alongside of his salary?

Here we have the richest and strongest nation in the world, yet we pay our Congressmen and Senators so little when compared to others that it is a wonder that so many sincere, conscientious, and loyal citizens are willing to stand the trials and tribulations of political campaigns to serve people so faithfully.

It's time to recognize that the servant of the people is worthy of his hire. Most Congressmen and Senators have to maintain two homes, one here in the expensive Nation's Capital, and one in his home State. The very nature of his position makes it necessary for him to meet more than the ordinary social obligations to keep up political contacts. This at times is rather expensive and is a real hardship to those who do not have outside income. Yes; they receive allowances for office staff, etc., but these allowances are used in the interest of

the people they represent, not for personal expenses of the Congressmen and Senators.

We expect our Congressmen and Senators to become experts in the many phases of Government and its operation so that they can intelligently legislate in the interest of the Nation and the people.

Those ramifications of Government include foreign relations and policy, internal security, atomic power, taxation, crime, and many other phases of governmental operation. Most Congressmen and Senators spend hours and hours of study to familiarize themselves with the problems facing them in sincerely performing their duties to the people and the Nation.

It would seem that the least we could do is to demand that they establish a wage commensurate with their services to the people. We, in the American Federation of Government Employees, believe in the doctrine that the laborer is worth his hire.

We are well aware of the reluctance of the Members of the Congress to take the initiative on this subject because of the risk of unjustified criticism. We believe therefore that public sentiment should be aroused to this need.

In reality these public servants are employees of the people and their employers should be made aware of the conditions inherent in their employment which make higher pay, commensurate with their services, mandatory.

Election to Congress ought to represent an honored opportunity to serve rather than a problem how to get by.

We know about this because we have talked to those who did not stay beyond one term because of the pay as well as to those who stay and supplement their income by writing and speech making and other pursuits.

As matters stand, we are trying to run the world's biggest business on shoestring salaries. We believe that it is just pure hard common sense to pay a salary sufficiently large and in line with the responsibilities in order that good qualified men will continue to seek public office. What is your opinion? We would like very much to have your ideas on this subject.

We suggest, make it \$20,000 a year.

JAMES A. CAMPBELL,
National President, AFGE.

Mr. WATKINS. I request further unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a front-page news item which appeared in the same issue of the Government Standard. This story was written by Hal Miller, a capable and experienced newspaperman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-THOUSAND-DOLLAR SALARY FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS PROPOSED TO IMPROVE LEGISLATIVE WORK—INCREASE ADVOCATED FOR SOLONS

(By Hal Miller)

The American Federation of Government Employees favors a pay raise for Members of Congress, to at least \$20,000 per annum.

Congressional salaries are completely out of line with salary rates in private industry for positions of similar prestige and responsibility. In fact, congressional salary rates are thoroughly out of line with rates in the executive and judicial branches of the Government itself.

IT'S TAXED, TOO

A United States Senator now receives \$12,500 per annum plus an expense allowance of \$2,500. The \$12,500 salary is taxed exactly as is the personal income of any other Government employee or citizen. So much of the \$2,500 expense allowance item as is not

actually used in expenses is likewise taxable as personal income.

It is, of course, entirely proper that senatorial and congressional salaries should be subject to regular taxation, the same as any other individual. No special treatment should be given for any individual or group in this country.

TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS COMMON

Salaries of \$25,000 are plentiful, if not actually commonplace in American industry today. In fact, such salaries are not unknown in our own labor organizations.

The Eighty-first Congress in Public Law 359 proposed establishment of \$22,500 as the basic annual rate of compensation for the heads of the various executive departments, \$20,000 for the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and \$18,000 for the sub-Cabinet positions of Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of the Air Force. Necessary expenses for travel and subsistence in connection with the performance of official business were also provided for these officials.

That same law authorized \$20,000 for each of two Presidential administrative assistants and for the Executive Secretary of the National Security Council. Two other White House secretaries were authorized salaries of \$20,000, three more at \$18,000, and seven at \$15,000.

FIXED BASIC PAY

Public Law 359 fixed the basic compensation of Under Secretaries of the various departments, the Deputy Postmaster General, the Solicitor General, the Comptroller General, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, the Federal Security Administrator, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Administrator of General Services, and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator at \$17,500 per annum.

The basic rate of compensation for the Chairman of the Munitions Board and a long list of officials at the head of various other Government agencies was fixed at \$16,000. Assistant heads of a long list of Federal agencies and a number of other positions, including the Governors of the various Territories and possessions, were set at \$15,000.

THEY TOP CONGRESS

The positions referred to above carry rates of compensation equal to and in excess of Senators and Congressmen.

It is important to note in this connection that they are appointive officials and as such are not required to bear certain election expenses nor are they subject to the demands of the constituents whose entertainment is a matter of "must" for persons holding electoral office.

In 1951 the Congress authorized the establishment of the so-called super grades in civil service. These grades are GS-16, 17, and 18 and carrying starting salaries of \$12,000, \$13,000, and \$14,000 respectively. Although it was contemplated at the time the act was passed there would be only 400 such jobs, a number of special authorizations have been accomplished and it is estimated that throughout the Government there are approximately 1,500 now in existence. The Central Intelligence Agency is reported to have no less than 130 such positions in that agency alone. These jobs are in the executive civilian service and the incumbents have no campaign expenses and are not up for reelection every few years.

BRASS TOPS CONGRESS

The high "brass" in the Armed Forces also receive salaries and expenses which far exceed that of Senators and Congressmen and even that of Cabinet officers who are their superiors.

It is past time for a practical examination of salaries and expenses of those in the legislative branch and the American Federation of Government Employees is wholeheartedly

in favor of Senators and Congressmen passing the necessary legislation to raise their salaries and expenses to an adequate level and the provisions of Public Law 359 are not too high.

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS—STATEMENT OF WALTER WHITE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last Wednesday, at the conclusion of the vote on the Anderson motion, Mr. Walter White, executive secretary of the NAACP, issued a statement on behalf of the 54 national organizations supporting the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, of which he is the chairman. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We want a rules change that will establish majority rule in the United States Senate and open the way for enactment of FEPC with uniform court enforcement powers and other vital civil-rights bills. This would have been made possible if the Anderson motion had prevailed.

This has been a brief but historic debate. It demonstrates the determination of Senators of both parties and Senator Moise, Independent, to assert and exercise the constitutional right of the Senate to determine the rules of its proceedings.

This is not a mere procedural question. Control of procedure means control of substance.

As a result of the debate on this issue, the American people have a keener realization of how the procedural matter of Senate rules kills legislation they need and want.

The 54 national organizations supporting the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and composed of members of the three major religious groups, the major labor organizations veterans, and other groups will continue to bring home to their members and to the American people generally, the tragic and dangerous cost in legislation and in our standing in the world of the filibuster road block against majority rule.

In opposing the Anderson motion, the Republican leadership in the Senate pledged itself (1) to enact FEPC and other civil-rights legislation, (2) to obtain the 64 votes necessary for cloture under rule 22, (3) to make revision of rule 22 the first order of business in the Rules Committee of the Senate.

The country will now look to the Republican Party to make good on these pledges.

On behalf of the organizations supporting the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, we express our heartfelt appreciation to all those Senators who joined in support of the Anderson motion.

They have done much to make clear to the American people the fact that the Senate will continue to operate under the ever-present threat of veto by filibuster.

The effort to establish majority rule will continue until the fight is won.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO RECESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I desire to say that when the Senate concludes its work today, I shall propose that it take a recess until Friday of this week, and then from Friday to Tuesday of next week.

HOLIDAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution making January 20, 1953, a holiday for Federal employees, field service postal employees, and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) making January 20, 1953, a holiday for Federal employees, field service postal employees, and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the several executive departments, independent establishments, and other governmental agencies of the United States, including the legislative and judicial branches, and of the District of Columbia, in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia shall be closed all day on Tuesday, January 20, 1953, Inauguration Day. All employees of such departments, establishments, and agencies and of the District of Columbia in such area, except those who may for special public reasons be required to be on duty on such day by the heads of their respective departments, establishments, or agencies, shall be excused from duty on that day; and such day shall be considered a holiday for the purpose of all statutes relating to the compensation and leave of employees of the United States, and of the District of Columbia, employed in such area. For the purposes of this resolution, the term "metropolitan area of the District of Columbia" shall include, in addition to the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md.; Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va.; and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, Va.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMERGENCY PUBLIC HEALTH TRAINING ACT OF 1953

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to be known as the Emergency Public Health Training Act of 1953. This bill provides for grants and scholarships in postgraduate education in the field of public health. The need for legislation such as this is urgent and it is my hope the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will begin hearings on the bill and on the whole problem of Federal aid to medical education in the very near future.

The bill provides for direct grants through the Public Health Service to all accredited schools of public health on the basis of their enrollment to a total not exceeding \$1,000,000 for each of the five fiscal years. Further grants are also provided for construction needs not in excess of \$1 million a year and for an additional sum for scholarships not to exceed \$250,000 per year. The purpose of the bill and to these grants is to make it possible to continue and extend the

training of personnel for public service in the field of public health.

There are today 10 accredited schools in the United States: California, Columbia, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, Pittsburgh, Tulane, and Yale. Six of these schools are supported by private philanthropy and four by the taxpayers of their States.

I have had a series of discussions with representatives of these schools of public health. It is their feeling—and I agree in that feeling—that the training of personnel to protect the public against disease is an essential part of public responsibility as is the training of personnel for the military forces to protect our Nation against a military aggressor. The request of the schools for Federal assistance to help support and expand their facilities and to aid such new schools as may be established is based on the recognition that our Government has a responsibility for the promotion of such training. The present plan for support of our public health institutions places an undue burden upon six privately supported institutions and upon the taxpayers of four States. Since our Nation gains from the training which these schools afford, it is desirable to equalize to some degree the financial cost which is now unevenly distributed.

The evidence is clear that the schools of public health are physically overcrowded. Their physical plant is bursting at the seams. The sum provided in this bill is a small fraction of what is needed, but it will help materially to provide facilities.

The scholarship section of this bill, section 376, is most desirable although it is less essential than the grants for maintenance and construction.

With specific regard to maintenance funds, a study of the facts makes it unmistakably clear that a number of the schools of public health are faced with the prospect of having to curtail or discontinue their operation unless financial relief can be found for them. In this critical period in our Nation's history, our Government cannot sit back and allow this to happen.

The formula for assistance submitted in this bill is the product of careful study by the schools of public health and by other experts in the field. It differs in some respects from the Federal Aid to Medical Education bill of the Eighty-second Congress which I was proud to co-sponsor, and which I plan again to support. Instead of providing a lump sum payment of \$1,000 per graduate student plus an extra \$1,000 for each student in excess of past enrollment, the bill which I now introduce provides for grants on the basis of 15 percent of basic operating costs of graduate instructions plus an additional \$500 for each full-time student in excess of average past enrollment. This proposed formula was arrived at on the assumption that a grant based on a certain fraction of the total operating cost will cover a unit of about 30 students regardless of the size of the school. In addition, we all agreed that the larger the student body the greater is the need for additional funds. When new students arrive in a school—and the need is great, so we must encourage the enrollment of

new students—the expansion of school facilities is necessary and hence my bill provides for a bonus clause of \$500 for each new student.

As a safeguard, the Emergency Public Health Training Act of 1953 provides that the total grant to each school may not exceed 50 percent of the basic operating cost of the school. Furthermore, the maximum amount spent shall not exceed \$1 million a year. It is also noteworthy that we determine average past enrollment on the basis of a sliding scale considering preceding fiscal years rather than any given calendar or academic years.

Finally, I wish to make it clear that in introducing this Emergency Public Health Training Act of 1953 I am in no way minimizing the importance or the desirability of enacting an omnibus Federal aid to medical education bill. We have tried to enact such legislation for a number of years and to no avail. It is my hope that some future Congress may enact the bill. We cannot wait for that period, however. The time to act in the field of public health is now. It is for that reason I have agreed to introduce this special legislation designed to cover the public-health phase of the medical problem on its own merits.

It is my hope that this legislation will become law during the Eighty-third Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 461) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for postgraduate education in the field of public health, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of seven bills and a concurrent resolution designed to make civil rights an increasing reality for all Americans, regardless of their race, religion, color, or national origin. In presenting this legislative program, I am proud to be joined by a distinguished array of my colleagues.

This is not the first time that I have stood before the Senate to make a plea for an end to discrimination against American citizens, nor am I the first Member of this body to do so. The struggle for civil rights has been a continual one since the beginning of our Nation. The story of our country's growth has been a story of an expanding democracy.

Our Nation stands today as the freest and most democratic power in the world. We are proud of the progress that we have made as a country in expanding opportunity, security, and human welfare for our citizens. There is no area of our life which has not developed toward greater democracy.

To be proud of our Nation and its progress, however, is not to be blind to the imperfections that still remain within our society. The most evident of

those imperfections and the one which cries the loudest for immediate remedy is in the area of civil rights. Discrimination based upon bias and prejudice still exists and so long as it is alive, we must be vigilant to eliminate the cancer from our body politic. Democracy is more than achievement, more than material progress, more than elections and government. Democracy is essentially a faith of freedom, of equality, of human dignity, and brotherhood.

This is a lesson which we now strive to get accepted in the world if our Nation is to avoid war and preserve its liberty. The struggle against the totalitarian forces of Stalinism is not merely of a military character. It is political and ideological in nature as well. We stand opposed to the doctrines which enslave men, reduce men to mere automata. We believe in the inherent dignity and worth of man, that man is an end in himself, that only in a genuinely free society can man attain his true nature. We believe that given equality of opportunity, each individual, irrespective of color, religion, national origin, or race, can realize his true self. These are the great values for which we are currently engaged in the struggle against communism.

Those of us who strive for the enactment of civil-rights legislation by the Congress, do so because we are convinced that the enactment of such legislation will help us as a nation in the world struggle against communism; and we do so because we believe that even if there were no Communists in the world, the discrimination which exists within our country must be eliminated if our democracy is to survive and be true to itself. We strive to strengthen the spirit and the fabric of democracy.

We have seen changes take place before our very eyes and within our own lifetime. These changes have been in our mores, in legislation, and in judicial decisions. We are all aware that this striving for full democracy has become a matter of real concern to all of us. Altogether, organizations representing more than 65 million citizens have gone on record favoring legislation assuring full civil liberties to minorities. These organizations varying in purpose and composition have loaned their names, their time, and their effort to the promulgation of legislation at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local. Churches of all denominations, veterans' groups, labor organizations, chambers of commerce, civic and community organizations, racial and ethnic groups—all are in the midst of the effort. The platform of each of the major political parties contained planks calling for an end to discrimination and the enactment of civil-rights legislation. The voice of the American people is being unmistakably heard.

We have just completed a national election. Both political parties came to the American people and said that they were champions of civil rights. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of these remarks excerpts from the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties. The President-elect came to the American people and on many occasions stated his

opposition to discrimination and his convictions in favor of equal opportunity. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of these remarks, excerpts from some of his statements.

It remains for the Congress to act in accordance with the wishes of the vast majority of the American people.

For these reasons, we bring again to the Senate a program for civil rights, fully consistent with the traditions and wishes of the American people. These bills are as follows:

First. Antilynching.

Second. Anti-poll-tax.

Third. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights.

Fourth. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation.

Fifth. A bill to strengthen existing civil-rights statutes.

Sixth. A bill to protect the right to political participation.

Seventh. Antipeonage.

Eighth. A resolution establishing a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights.

I ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated at the close of these remarks, brief statements in connection with each of these bills.

Members of the Senate will take note of the fact that there is not included among these eight civil-rights bills, a proposal dealing with equal opportunity in employment. Such a bill will soon be introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] and I will be pleased to join with him as a cosponsor. Members of the Senate are aware that such a bill was introduced by me during the Eighty-second Congress and was known as S. 1732. Under my chairmanship, the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations, held extensive hearings on the problem of equal opportunity in employment. As a result of those hearings, a new bill, S. 3368, was reported to the floor of the Senate with the cosponsorship of 17 Senators. It became known as the Humphrey-Ives bill. After conversations with the distinguished senior Senator from New York, we have decided to have the bill introduced this year by him as a genuine gesture of bipartisanship in this crucial area of civil rights.

I ask unanimous consent that statements and certain other matters I have prepared in connection with the bills and concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills and concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection the statements and other matters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. PASTORE), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as follows:

S. 462. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 463. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 464. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 465. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 466. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 467. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 468. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. PASTORE), was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is established a Joint Committee on Civil Rights (hereinafter called the Joint Committee), to be composed of seven Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation on the joint committee shall as nearly as may be feasible reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. It shall be the function of the joint committee to make a continuing study of matters relating to civil rights, including the rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States; to study means of improving respect for and enforcement of civil rights; and to advise with the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to civil rights.

SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, as it deems advisable. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes, as amended (2 U. S. C. 192, 193, 194), shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section. Within the limitations of its appropriations, the joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistance, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as, in its discretion, it deems necessary and advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 5. Funds appropriated to the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

SEC. 6. The joint committee may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of State and local governments and private organizations as it deems advisable.

The statements and matters presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

I. ANTILYNCHING—A STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON S. 462, A BILL TO PROTECT PERSONS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES FROM LYNCHING

It is a source of real satisfaction for all Americans to know that the crime of lynching is disappearing from the United States. In recent years, the number of lynchings reported to police-enforcement officials has been negligible. A generation ago, our newspapers reported an average of 50 or more lynchings a year. Last year the record shows that no lynchings were officially reported.

This fact is a tribute to the determination of the American people—of our people in every section of the country, North, South, East, and West—to make civil rights and personal security an increasing reality for all Americans, regardless of their race, color, or creed. Proof that we stand united upon that determination is the fact that both the Republican and Democratic Parties have pledged their efforts in behalf of legislation in the Congress to make lynching a Federal crime.

The need for effective Federal antilynching legislation remains in spite of the statistics. The statistics with regard to the extent of lynchings reflect not only community awareness, but also the fact that the techniques of the crime have been modified. We have no record of the number of people who have disappeared, the number who have received injuries from mob violence and remained silent, and the vast number of families and their friends who heed in silent terror a lesson that a Negro is not yet a free American. The fear of physical violence, because of their race, color, or creed is still a reality for many Americans.

Antilynching legislation is not new legislation. It has been before the Congress for 23 sessions. It has frequently passed the House of Representatives, only to fall before the parliamentary tactics of a minority in the Senate determined to obstruct the bill. It is time the majority which favors antilynching legislation acted to enact the bill. Until we, as a Nation and as a people, have removed every vestige of the crime in the United States, our moral position in the world is undermined. We must make it clear to the world that all Americans know the meaning of that most fundamental freedom, freedom from fear.

The present need for effective Federal antilynching legislation was clearly pointed out as recently as 1947 in the thoughtful and painstaking report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. That distinguished committee, headed by Mr. Charles E. Wilson, who was then president of General Electric and is today Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, strongly urged the prompt enactment of adequate legislation. Moreover, the committee made specific recommendations as to the content of the necessary legislation. Our bill conforms in detail with those recommendations.

1. The Committee on Civil Rights urged that lynching be given broad definition. Our bill in section 5 (a) defines lynching as mob violence which is committed because of the victim's race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion, or which is committed against the person accused of crime as a tragic substitute for the ordinary processes of criminal justice.

2. The committee urged that legislation, to be adequate, must condemn both private individuals and public officials who "mete out summary punishment and private vengeance" and must also condemn public officials who are derelict in their duty to bring

members of lynch mobs to justice. Our bill in sections 6 and 7 is carefully drawn to accomplish these objectives.

3. The committee urged legislative authorization so that suspected lynchings can be investigated by the Federal Government immediately. Section 8 of our bill directs the Attorney General to institute such full and prompt investigations.

4. The committee urged "adequate and flexible penalties ranging up to \$10,000 and 20-year prison terms." Section 6 of our bill provides for a fine of \$1,000, or 1 year's imprisonment, or both, for anyone who aids, abets, or participates in a lynching. If, however, the lynching results in death or maiming or serious physical or mental injury or in serious damage to property, penalties up to a \$10,000 fine or 20 years' imprisonment may be imposed. Section 7 of our bill deals specifically with governmental officers or employees and provides for fines up to \$5,000 and up to 5-year prison terms for officials who fail to make all diligent efforts to prevent lynchings or who are derelict in bringing members of lynching mobs to justice.

5. The committee, in discussing the general policy of sanctions in civil rights cases, said that "the potential use of civil sanctions . . . is very great." Our bill specifically provides for civil action in behalf of a lynching victim or his next of kin for damages resulting from his injury or death. Any person who violates this law, whether a private individual or a Government official, is to be held civilly liable as well as the State or governmental subdivision thereof in which the lynching takes place, unless the officers responsible for police enforcement have carried out their duties with diligence.

Lynching has robbed thousands of Americans of their lives, millions more of their freedom to walk erect in their own land, and has done serious damage to the prestige of our country here and abroad. The responsibility for lynching is national in scope. The prompt enactment and the vigorous enforcement of this bill will help discharge that responsibility.

II. POLL TAX—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY ON S. 463, OUTLAWING THE POLL TAX AS A CONDITION OF VOTING IN ANY PRIMARY OR OTHER ELECTION FOR NATIONAL OFFICERS

This bill would outlaw once and for all the poll tax in national elections. In decreeing that no State shall exact a price of admission to the Federal voting booth, it advances the United States a long step forward on the road to universal suffrage.

The evil of the poll tax has long been recognized. Although Congress has exempted servicemen from the poll tax and the tax has been abolished by State legislatures in all but six States, there are still millions of Americans to whom the priceless heritage of voting is a luxury. Today, when the very meaning of freedom is challenged by the ruthless forces of totalitarianism, Americans can no longer tolerate this excise on democracy.

To eliminate this obstacle in voting, our bill declares it unlawful "to levy, collect, or require the payment of, any poll tax" as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, Senator, or Member of the House of Representatives. The bill empowers Federal district courts to enjoin or otherwise prevent violations of the act and authorizes the aggrieved voter or the Federal Government to bring civil suit for relief should a violation take place.

The basis of a democracy is that its government rests on the consent of the governed. The machinery for expressing that consent is the right to vote. The history of our Government has been one of an expanding democracy. The efforts of our people have been to enlarge the area of suffrage. We have, with slow and yet deliberate movement, been removing the blights on our

democracy. Property, religious, and sex qualifications have all disappeared. Racial qualifications have now largely been abolished and exist only by subterfuge and indirection.

It might be of interest to the Senate of the United States to recall that during our early days immediately following the Revolutionary War our Colonies had many types of suffrage qualifications. The Colonies of New York, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire required the ownership of real estate stated in terms of value as a condition for voting. The Colonies of North Carolina and Virginia required real estate stated in terms of acres as a condition of voting. Delaware, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Georgia, South Carolina, and Maryland required either real estate or other property. In New Jersey it was necessary to possess 50 pounds of proclamation money before a resident could vote. In Pennsylvania it was necessary for an individual to have paid the public taxes before he could vote.

These property and taxpaying qualifications for voting have all been removed. They have been removed as the people have constantly demonstrated their faith in democratic government and as they have come to earn for themselves and gain for themselves the power to rule. It will be observed from a table which I am hereby incorporating in the RECORD at this point that these undemocratic and restrictive qualifications are now all removed and have been removed in most of our States for many years.

TABLE 1.—Duration of property and taxpaying qualifications

	Property qualifications ended in—	Taxpaying in—
Connecticut.....	1818	1845
Delaware.....	1792	1897
Georgia.....	1789	1798
Maryland.....	1810	(¹)
Massachusetts.....	1821	1863
New Hampshire.....	1784	1792
New Jersey.....	1844	(¹)
New York.....	1821	1826
North Carolina.....	1856	1868
Pennsylvania.....	(¹)	1933
Rhode Island.....	1842	(¹)
South Carolina.....	1778	1810
Virginia.....	1850	(¹)
Tennessee.....	1834	(¹)
Ohio.....	(¹)	1851
Louisiana.....	(¹)	1845
Mississippi.....	(¹)	1832

¹ Had none.

Vermont and Kentucky came into the Union in 1791 and 1792, respectively, and Indiana in 1816 but without property or taxpaying qualifications. After Mississippi, in 1817, no State came in with a property or taxpaying qualification.

One other restriction on suffrage and thus an obstacle to democratic government was the sex qualification on voting. It was not until 1920 when the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States was adopted that the full suffrage was granted to women.

The change came about slowly and in parts. Women were first given the right to vote on school matters in certain States. Then they were given the right to vote on tax and bond loans. Finally they were given the right to cast their ballots on the same terms as men.

The most serious obstacle to the suffrage that remains is the poll tax. It has its roots in an attempt by a number of States to prevent the Negro from voting. Its effect, however, is frequently also to disenfranchise the poor white as well.

The fifteenth amendment to the Constitution once and for all prohibited the States from denying the suffrage to any American on account of his race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Prior to that, of course, the Negro had been considered a slave and was thus excluded by law from voting in most States. It is interesting, however, that even prior to the Civil War the States of

Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont never excluded the Negro from voting.

Poll-tax laws were enacted following the period of reconstruction. There are historical reasons for these laws, Mr. President, and I fully appreciate them. The North must never forget and never ignore its share of blame for the serious injury done the South in the period following the Civil War. All the poll-tax laws now in effect were enacted between 1890 and 1903. That sorry era in our national history explains to a large extent the reason for the lingering prejudices which still continue to exist in many sections below Mason and Dixon's line.

In an attempt to keep the Negro from voting, a number of States used ingenious legal devices. The most famous of those are the grandfather clause, the white primary, and the poll tax. The one that remains today is the poll tax.

Whatever historical reasons there may be for the poll tax, however, there can be no justification for this undemocratic infringement upon the franchise. The purpose of the poll tax was to limit the electorate and that it has done. In Virginia, for example, one of the six remaining poll-tax States, the number of votes cast in the election of 1900, the last election before the enactment of the poll tax, was 266,000. The number voting in Virginia in the election of 1902, the next election after the tax was enacted, was 136,000. The poll tax evidently caused a reduction in the electorate of 49 percent. Another State which illustrates the extent to which the poll tax was successful in limiting the electorate was Mississippi, which enacted its poll tax in 1890. The number of votes cast in the election prior to the enactment of the tax was 117,000. In the very next election the number voting was 52,000, a reduction of 56 percent.

The poll tax continues to disenfranchise American citizens and frustrate the principles of majority representative government. I have asked the Library of Congress to analyze for me the laws which now govern payment of poll tax in the six remaining States, and I include a summary table of the poll-tax-payment requirements and laws in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE 2.—Poll-tax requirements in 6 States

State	Annual poll-tax payment	Possible maximum poll-tax payment
Alabama.....	\$1.50	\$36.00
Arkansas.....	1.00	2.00
Mississippi.....	2.00	6.00
Tennessee.....	1.00	2.58
Texas.....	1.00	1.75
Virginia.....	1.50	5.01

¹ General elections only. Poll tax abolished in primary elections.

Alabama: Payment must be made on or before the 1st day of February preceding the election. Amount, \$1.50, payable by persons from 21 to 45 years of age. Back taxes must be paid (constitution, art. VIII, sec. 178, 194; code (1940), title 14, sec. 71; title 17, secs. 12, 136-138; title 51, secs. 237-248).

Arkansas: Payment must be made before October 1. Amount, \$1 (constitution, art. III, sec. 1, art. XIV, sec. 3; amendment No. 8; Stat. Ann. (1947; Supp. 1949), secs. 3-104.1, 3-106, 3-108 to 3-109).

Mississippi: Payment must be made on or before the 1st day of February preceding the election. Amount, \$2, subject to increase by county supervisors to not more than \$3. All persons between the ages of 21 and 60, except those who are deaf and dumb or blind or who have lost a hand or foot, are subject to the tax. Taxes for the 2 years preceding the election must be paid (constitution, art. XII, secs. 241, 243; Code Ann. (1942), secs. 3235-3236, 9751; as amended Laws 1950, ch. 238).

Tennessee: Payment of tax for the year preceding the election must be made 60 days

before election. Amount, \$1, payable by male inhabitants between the ages of 21 and 50, except those who are deaf, dumb, blind, or incapable of labor and of earning a livelihood (constitution, art. II, sec. 28; art. IV, sec. 1; art. XI, sec. 12; Code Ann. (Williams, 1934), secs. 2027, 4820, 10239).

Texas: Payment must be made before the 1st day of February next preceding the election. Amount, \$1.50, payable by persons between the ages of 21 and 60 who resided in the State in the January preceding the levy, except Indians not taxed, and persons insane, blind, deaf, or dumb, or those who have lost one hand or foot, or are permanently disabled. Counties may levy an additional tax of 25 cents, cities an additional tax of \$1 (constitution, art. VI, sec. 2; art. VII, sec. 3; art. VIII, sec. 1; Civil Stat. Ann. (Vernon, 1939), arts. 1030, 2955, 2959, 7046).

Virginia: Payment must be made at least 6 months before the election. Amount, \$1.50, payable by all persons over 21, except veterans of the War Between the States and the wives or widows of such veterans. Taxes for the

3 years next preceding the election must be paid (constitution, art. II, secs. 18, 20, 21; art. XIII, sec. 173; code (1950), secs. 24-17, 24-22, 58-49 to 58-51).

Today the statistics clearly demonstrate that those States which have the poll tax thus exclude from a meaningful right of citizenship many millions of people who, because of the poll tax, are prevented from voting. This is serious not only to the States involved. It is also serious to the Nation, since Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives elected from those States vote on crucial matters of national importance when they arrive in the Congress and occupy positions of national power.

It will be of interest to the Senate to see certain statistics in connection with the election of 1948 in those States which had the poll tax in that year. This material was supplied to me by the Library of Congress, and is based on reports of the United States Bureau of the Census and the House of Representatives. I am hereby incorporating it in the RECORD at this point:

Voting population and votes cast in poll-tax States, 1948 and 1952

	Voting population		Presidential votes cast		Percent voting	
	1948	1952	1948	1952	1948	1952
Alabama.....	1,676,000	1,709,000	214,980	426,120	12.8	24.9
Arkansas.....	1,048,000	1,070,000	242,475	404,800	23.1	37.8
Mississippi.....	1,141,000	1,176,000	192,190	285,519	16.9	24.3
Texas.....	4,573,000	4,845,000	1,147,245	2,076,846	25.1	42.8
Virginia.....	1,942,000	1,979,000	419,256	619,689	21.6	31.3

Sources: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current population reports, Series P-25, No. 63, Aug. 31, 1952. New York Times, Dec. 13, 1952, p. 12.

Voting population and voting participation in presidential elections, 1948 and 1952, by State

	Voting population ¹		Presidential votes cast		Percent voting	
	1948	1952	1948	1952	1948	1952
United States.....	94,916,000	98,377,000	48,833,680	61,547,861	51.4	62.5
Alabama.....	1,676,000	1,709,000	214,980	426,120	12.8	24.9
Arizona.....	416,000	495,000	177,065	260,569	42.6	52.6
Arkansas.....	1,048,000	1,070,000	242,475	404,800	23.1	37.8
California.....	7,237,000	7,333,000	4,021,538	5,141,849	55.6	70.0
Colorado.....	761,000	880,000	515,237	630,103	67.7	71.6
Connecticut.....	1,368,000	1,445,000	883,518	1,096,911	64.6	75.9
Delaware.....	212,000	220,000	139,073	174,010	65.5	79.1
Florida.....	1,683,000	1,978,000	577,643	988,986	34.3	50.0
Georgia.....	2,057,000	2,114,000	418,760	651,303	20.4	30.8
Idaho.....	339,000	352,000	214,816	276,254	63.4	78.5
Illinois.....	5,810,000	5,967,000	3,984,046	4,481,058	68.6	75.1
Indiana.....	2,517,000	2,626,000	1,656,214	1,955,325	65.8	74.5
Iowa.....	1,643,000	1,688,000	1,038,264	1,268,773	63.2	75.2
Kansas.....	1,189,000	1,276,000	788,819	896,166	66.3	70.2
Kentucky.....	1,655,000	1,655,000	822,658	993,148	49.7	60.0
Louisiana.....	1,522,000	1,613,000	416,326	651,952	27.4	40.4
Maine.....	561,000	545,000	264,787	351,786	47.2	64.5
Maryland.....	1,498,000	1,570,000	596,735	902,074	39.8	57.5
Massachusetts.....	3,249,000	3,220,000	2,155,347	2,383,398	66.3	74.0
Michigan.....	4,009,000	4,264,000	2,109,609	2,798,592	52.6	65.6
Minnesota.....	1,869,000	1,899,000	1,212,226	1,379,482	64.9	72.6
Mississippi.....	1,141,000	1,176,000	192,190	285,519	16.9	24.3
Missouri.....	2,564,000	2,656,000	1,578,628	1,892,062	61.9	71.2
Montana.....	347,000	362,000	224,278	265,037	64.6	73.2
Nebraska.....	823,000	882,000	488,939	609,660	59.4	69.1
Nevada.....	105,000	115,000	62,117	82,190	59.3	71.5
New Hampshire.....	340,000	351,000	231,440	272,952	68.1	77.8
New Jersey.....	3,249,000	3,476,000	1,949,555	2,419,554	60.0	69.6
New Mexico.....	317,000	376,000	185,767	238,608	58.6	63.5
New York.....	10,155,000	10,476,000	6,274,527	7,128,241	61.8	68.0
North Carolina.....	2,167,000	2,326,000	791,209	1,210,910	36.5	52.1
North Dakota.....	346,000	350,000	220,716	270,127	63.7	77.2
Ohio.....	5,340,000	5,350,000	2,936,071	3,700,758	55.0	69.2
Oklahoma.....	1,295,000	1,372,000	721,599	948,984	55.7	69.2
Oregon.....	1,025,000	1,035,000	524,080	695,059	51.1	67.2
Pennsylvania.....	6,823,000	7,043,000	3,735,149	4,580,562	54.7	65.0
Rhode Island.....	530,000	533,000	326,998	414,498	61.5	77.8
South Carolina.....	1,042,000	1,112,000	142,571	341,121	13.7	30.7
South Dakota.....	376,000	398,000	250,105	294,283	66.5	74.0
Tennessee.....	1,911,000	1,930,000	550,283	892,553	28.8	46.2
Texas.....	4,573,000	4,845,000	1,147,245	2,076,846	25.1	42.8
Utah.....	377,000	414,000	276,305	329,554	73.3	79.6
Vermont.....	230,000	231,000	123,382	153,557	53.7	66.5
Virginia.....	1,942,000	1,979,000	419,256	619,689	21.6	31.3
Washington.....	1,565,000	1,543,000	905,059	1,102,708	57.8	71.5
West Virginia.....	1,120,000	1,128,000	748,750	873,548	66.9	77.4
Wisconsin.....	2,132,000	2,251,000	1,276,890	1,607,370	59.9	71.4
Wyoming.....	169,000	180,000	101,425	129,251	59.9	71.8

¹ Voting population is defined as those persons eligible to vote because of age alone—21 years of age and over, in all States except Georgia which is 18 years of age and over.

² States now having law requiring poll tax payment as prerequisite for voting.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current population reports, Series P-25, No. 63, Aug. 31, 1952. New York Times, Dec. 13, 1952, p. 12 (1952 official vote by States).

The poll tax is a threat to democracy not only because of its undesirable political consequences but because it has damaging social consequences. It affects that segment of the population which has the lowest per capita income. When those individuals are denied their voice in the choosing of the Government, it is only logical to assume that their desires as to how the Government is to be run will in fact be ignored. We cannot be certain that we indeed have representative government in America so long as we cannot be certain that the Representatives elected to the Congress are chosen by the majority of the people in their respective districts and States.

I think it is fair for me to state that all who have the best interests of our Nation at heart will agree that the poll tax must be abolished. The legislative debate that now takes place in connection with this issue more directly hinges on the question of how the poll tax is to be abolished. Many advocate a constitutional amendment as the means to accomplish this objective. In my honest judgment, Mr. President, I believe that an anti-poll-tax bill enacted by the Congress would be constitutional without an amendment.

There are many who say that the poll tax should be abolished by State action and by State action alone. They, too, condemn the poll tax but believe the most effective way to rid our Nation of its consequences is through local action. Local action, Mr. President, is, of course, always preferable but we have waited too long. These laws have been on the books in most cases for about 50 years. There are resistances to changing the poll tax within the States that now have such a tax because the very forces controlling the instrumentalities in the State government which have the power to abolish the tax are the very ones who benefit most from it. It is expecting a great deal to expect a genuine repeal of the tax by those whom the tax has put into authority.

President Truman in his message on civil rights in 1947 said, "We cannot await the growth of a will to act in the slowest State or the most backward community. Our National Government must show the way." The responsibility rests on the Congress. I pray that the Congress will live up to its responsibilities and accept the challenge.

III. REORGANIZE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE— STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON S. 464, TO REORGANIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FOR THE PROTECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS

The Federal Government has a responsibility in all its branches to protect the civil rights of the American people. This bill is designed to strengthen the Department of Justice in its responsibilities to protect civil rights of all Americans.

This bill calls for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General to be in charge of a civil-rights division of the Department of Justice. If the Federal Government is to live up to its responsibilities to enforce the civil-rights statutes now part of the established law of our land, it is essential its law-enforcement agency be strengthened so that it can effectively perform its duties. The protection of civil rights is now and must become further a foremost activity of the Department of Justice. We must be vigilant so that we demonstrate both to the peoples of the world and to our own citizens that our Government is dedicated to the preservation of freedom and democracy. Violations of liberty must therefore be met effectively, immediately, and energetically by the arm of the Federal Government. The existence of a civil-rights division is thus a fundamental part of a realistic program.

Our bill also makes provision for increasing the personnel of the Federal Bureau of

Investigation to carry out the duties of the Bureau in its investigation of civil-rights cases. We also provide for the Bureau to include a special training program for its agents responsible for the investigation of civil-rights cases. Here too is an essential plank which should receive the unanimous support of the Congress. Law enforcement is one of the most vital needs of the American society.

IV. NO SEGREGATION IN TRANSPORTATION— STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY ON S. 465, PROVIDING RELIEF AGAINST CERTAIN FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION IN INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION

Millions of Americans took pride and satisfaction in recent decisions of the Supreme Court declaring segregation and other forms of discrimination in interstate transportation to be illegal. The Supreme Court has again affirmed the basic creed of the American people and their faith in liberty and equality for all men. This bill is introduced to implement and support the existing Supreme Court decisions.

The illegality of racial discrimination in interstate transportation has been conclusively adjudicated in *Morgan v. Virginia* (328 U. S. 372 (1946)) and *Henderson v. United States* (339 U. S. 816 (1950)). Legislation must be enacted now to provide adequate remedies for such discrimination.

This bill provides that all persons traveling within the jurisdiction of the United States should be entitled to equal treatment in any public conveyance engaged in interstate commerce, without segregation or other discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

This bill would also make punishable by fine and subject to a civil suit the conduct of anyone who denies or attempts to deny equal treatment to travelers of every race, color, religion, or national origin in the use of a public conveyance, or carrier.

A final provision of the bill would make it unlawful for the bus, railroad, or other public carrier facility engaged in interstate commerce to segregate or otherwise discriminate against passengers based on race, color, religion, or national origin. It would also make it unlawful for an officer, agent, or employee of such carrier to so discriminate.

V. CIVIL-RIGHTS STATUTES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY ON S. 468 TO STRENGTHEN EXISTING CIVIL-RIGHTS STATUTES

The need to enlarge the scope of Federal legislation protecting the rights of individuals to liberty, security, and citizenship is very clear. This can be achieved by enacting new legislation and it must also be achieved by strengthening existing civil-rights laws. One such law to be strengthened is a criminal conspiracy statute (18 U. S. C. 241) which has been used to protect rights secured by the Federal Government against encroachment by private individuals and public officers. Section 201 of our bill is designed to achieve that effect. It does so by extending the protection of the Federal Government to any inhabitant of the United States, not just to a citizen alone. Our courts have ruled (*Baldwin v. Franks* (120 U. S. 678)) that an alien does not come within the protection of the statute. In deciding that case the Court stated:

"It may be by this construction of the statute some are excluded from the protection it affords who are as much entitled to it as those who are included; but that is a defect, if it exists, which can be cured by Congress, but not by the courts."

The amendment which our bill proposes would bring the language of the statute into conformity with other supplemental protective statutes (18 U. S. C. 242). Under the broader statutes, the courts have already decided (*United States v. Classic* (313 U. S.

299)) that an inhabitant is protected from interference by a State official in his constitutionally protected right to vote in a congressional election or primary. There is more than the need for conformity to support this section, however. The protection of inhabitants is a well-established public policy of our country. We, in fact, subscribed to that policy in the United Nations Charter to promote respect for the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

This bill would make a further change in the existing statute by protecting inhabitants not only when their Federal rights are infringed upon as a result of the conspiracy but also where the infringement is performed by persons acting individually. Whenever a person enjoins, oppresses, threatens, or intimidates any inhabitant of the United States in the free exercise or enjoyment of his rights and privileges, that inhabitant should be protected by our laws.

Our bill would also plug gaps in the existing laws insofar as civil remedies to the aggrieved are concerned. The present statute (sec. 47, title 8) appears to provide a civil remedy whenever a citizen's rights are interfered with as a result of a conspiracy. Even this remedy is inadequate, as demonstrated by a recent Supreme Court decision (*Collins v. Hardyman*, June 4, 1951). It appears to me, and I am pleased to report that this and the other recommendations of the bill apparently have the support of the Department of Justice, that a civil remedy should be provided the injured person, either where he has been the victim of a conspiracy or the victim of individual action to interfere with his rights and privileges as an inhabitant of the United States. Such an individual, therefore, should have the right to sue those found guilty of violating the law, whether the violators are public officials or private citizens. These suits should be brought in the Federal courts or appropriate State courts, no matter what the sum of money involved in the controversy.

One other question has been raised by the courts (*Screws v. United States* (325 U. S. 91)) with regard to the rights, privileges, and immunities which inhabitants of the United States should enjoy. The courts have held (*Pullen v. United States* (164 F. (2d))) that our statutes protect inhabitants only against being deprived of their constitutional rights willfully. The proof of a general bad purpose alone may not be enough. We therefore consider it essential to enumerate in some detail some of the rights to be protected by our laws. All of these rights have already been sustained by the courts and are not new. The rights we desire specifically to set forth follow:

1. The right to be immune from exaction of fine without due process of law (*Culp v. United States* (131 F. (2d) 93)).

2. The right to be immune from punishment for a crime except after a fair trial and confession after due process of law (*Screws v. United States* (325 U. S. 91); *Crews v. United States* (180 F. (2d) 746); *Moore v. Dempsey* (261 U. S. 86); *Mooney v. Holohan* (294 U. S. 103)).

3. The right to be immune from physical violence applied to compel a confession of a crime or to exact testimony (*Chambers v. Florida* (309 U. S. 227); *United States v. Sutherland* (37 F. Supp. 344)).

4. The right to be free of illegal restraint such as being detained by a sheriff without jurisdiction (*Callette v. United States* (132 F. (2d) 902); *United States v. Trierweiler* (52 F. Supp. 4)).

5. The right to protect the person and property without discrimination by reason of race, color, or national origin (*Callette v. United States*; *Yick-Wo v. Hopkins* (118 U. S. 35)).

6. The right to vote as protected by Federal laws (*United States v. Classic* (313 U. S. 299); *United States v. Saylor* (322 U. S. 385); *Smith v. Allwright* (321 U. S. 649)).

VI. RIGHT TO VOTE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY ON S. 468, TO PROTECT THE RIGHT TO POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

The Hatch Act (18 U. S. C. 594) now makes it a crime for anyone to intimidate or coerce an American citizen for the purpose of interfering with his right to vote as he wishes in elections for national office. This law was enacted in 1939, at a time when there was doubt in Congress as to the constitutionality of Federal regulation over nominating primaries. It is clear, however, today that the Federal Government does have the right to regulate the nominating primaries system. This has been so since 1941 and the case of *U. S. v. Classic* (317 U. S. 299). It is therefore essential that our laws be clear and unequivocal in this respect.

This bill therefore provides that it is a crime to intimidate or coerce an American citizen and thus interfere with his right to vote in primary and special elections, as well as general elections for Federal office. This bill also makes certain minor technical changes in the existing laws so as to unequivocally declare it to be the right of citizens to vote at any election without distinction as to race, color, religion, or national origin; and that interfering with that right by anyone is a crime. These changes have been requested by the Justice Department, which has been responsible for carrying out the provisions of the law and protecting the rights of the citizens.

It is clear that discrimination against voters on the basis of race or color is a direct violation of the fifteenth amendment (*Smith v. Allwright* (321 U. S. 649)), and the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment (*Nixon v. Herndon* (273 U. S. 536); *Nixon v. Condon* (286 U. S. 73)). Our courts have continually ruled that discrimination in voting based on religion or national origin is arbitrary, unreasonable, and "by their very nature odious to a free people whose institutions are founded on the doctrine of equality."

This bill further strengthens the existing civil-rights statutes insofar as voting is concerned by providing in addition to criminal penalties that the party whose voting rights are interfered with can bring a suit for injury against the person or persons who interfered or attempted to interfere with his right to vote. One other provision of our bill would authorize the Attorney General to bring a law suit in the courts to prevent violation of the law or provide relief if the violations take place.

VII. ANTIPEONAGE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY ON S. 467, TO STRENGTHEN THE CRIMINAL LAWS RELATING TO PEONAGE, SLAVERY, AND INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the Department of Justice received 85 complaints concerning possible peonage and involuntary servitude. I am informed that since that date, the complaints have continued. Peonage, of course, is a form of involuntary servitude rising out of a payment of a debt. It is essential that our laws be strengthened so that this form of involuntary servitude will be eliminated once and for all from our society. This is certainly the intent of the thirteenth amendment to our Constitution.

Our existing laws (secs. 1581, 1583, and 1584 of title 18, U. S. Code) declare the following to be a crime: holding or returning persons to conditions of peonage, arresting persons with the intent of pressing them or returning them to conditions of peonage; kidnapping, arresting, or carrying away persons with the intent that they be sold into involuntary servitude or held as slaves; enticing, persuading, or inducing persons to go on board vessels with the intent that they be made or held as slaves; and knowingly and wilfully holding persons to invol-

untary servitude or selling a person into any condition of involuntary servitude.

There are two basic changes which must be made to strengthen these laws. First, it is essential to make clear that to hold an individual in involuntary servitude is punishable; secondly, it is important that not only the acts described above be considered criminal, but an attempt to commit the acts be in itself criminal. Every human being must have the right to be protected in this most vital area of his personal security and human dignity.

VIII. JOINT COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3, A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A JOINT COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

This concurrent resolution would establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, to be composed of 14 members, 7 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 7 Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, with due regard for party representation. The duty of the joint committee is to make and conduct a study relating to civil rights and civil liberties, to study means of improving responsibility for an enforcement of our laws protecting civil rights; and to advise, with the committees of the Congress who have the legislative responsibility relating to this vital area of our democratic heritage.

It is essential that this joint committee, like any other joint committee of the Congress, should be authorized to hold whatever hearings it deems necessary, with the power of subpoena to carry out its functions. One of the important activities should also be that of consulting with representatives of State and local governments and with private organizations vitally interested in the preservation of human rights.

I urge upon the Senate that it act speedily and effectively to enact the provisions of this concurrent resolution. Whatever considerations there may be calling for further study of other proposals dealing with the area of human rights, there can be no excuse and no justification for further delay as it affects the basic provision of this bill. This problem is a serious one and a most complex one which calls for constant study, constant evaluation, and constant effort.

POLITICAL PARTY PLATFORMS ON CIVIL RIGHTS REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

The Republican Party will not mislead, exploit, or attempt to confuse minority groups for political purposes. All American citizens are entitled to full, impartial enforcement of Federal laws relating to their civil rights.

We believe that it is the primary responsibility of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions, and this power, reserved to the States, is essential to the maintenance of our Federal Republic. However, we believe that the Federal Government should take supplemental action within its constitutional jurisdiction to oppose discrimination against race, religion, or national origin.

We will prove our good faith by—
Appointing qualified persons, without distinction of race, religion, or national origin, to responsible positions in the Government.
Federal action toward the elimination of lynching.

Federal action toward the elimination of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting.

Appropriate action to end segregation in the District of Columbia.

Enacting Federal legislation to further just and equitable treatment in the area of discriminatory employment practices. Federal action should not duplicate State efforts to end such practices; should not set up another huge bureaucracy.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

In order that the will of the American people may be expressed upon all legislative proposals, we urge that action be taken at the beginning of the Eighty-third Congress to improve congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after a reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House.

The Democratic Party is committed to support and advance the individual rights and liberties of all Americans.

Our country is founded on the proposition that all men are created equal. This means that all citizens are equal before the law and should enjoy equal political rights. They should have equal opportunities for education, for economic advancement, and for decent living conditions.

We will continue our efforts to eradicate discrimination based on race, religion, or national origin.

We know this task requires action, not just in one section of the Nation, but in all sections. It requires the cooperative efforts of individual citizens and action by State and local government. It also requires Federal action. The Federal Government must live up to the ideals of the Declaration of Independence and must exercise the powers vested in it by the Constitution.

We are proud of the progress that has been made in securing equality of treatment and opportunity in the Nation's Armed Forces and the civil service and all areas under Federal jurisdiction. The Department of Justice has taken an important part in successfully arguing in the courts for the elimination of many illegal discriminations, including those involving rights to own and use real property, to engage in gainful occupations and to enroll in publicly supported higher educational institutions. We are determined that the Federal Government shall continue such policies.

At the same time, we favor Federal legislation effectively to secure those rights to everyone: (1) the right to equal opportunity for employment; (2) the right to security of persons; (3) the right to full and equal participation in the Nation's political life, free from arbitrary restraints. We also favor legislation to perfect existing Federal civil rights statutes and to strengthen the administrative machinery for the protection of civil rights.

STATEMENTS BY PRESIDENT-ELECT EISENHOWER ON CIVIL RIGHTS

"Let us once and for all resolve that henceforth we shall be guided in our relations with our fellows by the American creed that all men are created equal—and remain equal. All of us who salute the flag, whatever our color or creed or job or place of birth may be, are Americans entitled to the full rights and the full privileges of our citizenship. In a time when America needs all the brains, all the skills, all the spiritual strength and dedicated services of its 157,000,000 people, discrimination is criminally stupid." (Eisenhower, American Legion, New York City, August 25, 1952.)

"Equality of opportunity was part of the vision of the men who founded our Nation. It is a principle deeply imbedded in our religious faith. And neither at home nor in the eyes of the world can America risk the weakness which inevitably results when any group of our people are ranked—politically or economically—as second-class citizens." (Eisenhower, Columbia, S. C., September 30, 1952.)

"We must make equality of opportunity a living fact for every American—regardless of race, color, or creed. To do that is part of the unfinished business of America."

"Equality of opportunity has its strongest roots in our religious faith. Every individual act, every law, every political maneuver, every pressure which infringes on the political and economic rights of any American or

any group of Americans weakens America. It gives powerful ammunition to America's enemies. It will eventually betray the freedom of each of us." (Eisenhower, Los Angeles, October 9, 1952.)

"Now I bring you another question obviously of great interest to you people. We know that America has not achieved under its great Constitution that full perfection of operation that it should with respect to equal opportunity for all citizens. There is discrimination. This crusade is pledged to use every single item of leadership and influence it has to eliminate it. It intends to enforce the full Constitution, not part of it." (Eisenhower, Harlem, October 25, 1952.)

"I pledge to devote myself toward making equality of opportunity a living reality for every American. There is no room left in America for second-class citizenship for anybody." (From a summary of campaign pledges released by Eisenhower's New York headquarters November 1, 1952.)

APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUPPORT OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 469) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to discuss the bill for about 15 minutes.

Mr. President, widespread and continuing dissatisfaction with the notoriously antiquated and sickly slipshod system in which the Federal Government handles fiscal matters has been expressed by many persons in and out of Congress. That is especially true of the way appropriations measures are expended. The other day, our colleague, the very able and experienced new chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, very properly pointed out that Congress is employing the same techniques in appropriating eighty billions that it used when appropriations were less than five billions annually. The facts are that the important function of making appropriations in these days of huge expenditures has gotten completely out of hand. The very weight of the fantastic size of present-day appropriations has broken the back of congressional fiscal machinery. Appropriations must be modernized and streamlined and we must not spare the horses in doing so.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is generally known as a keen and painstaking student of Federal fiscal policies, has been calling attention to the huge, but almost forgotten, unexpended balances in the current accounts of various departments of the Federal Government. He suggests that our unexpended balances may reach the colossal total of \$100,000,000,000. While everyone admits the amount is huge, no one in Government can pinpoint the exact number of dollars involved. It is said that it will require many months to find out the precise status of our unexpended balance. Any banker or industrialist in

the United States who did not know to the last penny the precise amount of his unexpended balance would be sent to a hospital, a bankruptcy court, or on a job-hunting tour. To not know and to not make fiscal calculations accordingly is no way for Congress to handle the people's hard-earned money. It is an understatement to say the people are shocked by the Byrd disclosures. They must feel that the Members of Congress who represent them in Washington are little children lost in the woods when it comes to finances.

Something must be done to bring order out of such chaos. In that spirit and with that objective very much in mind, I have devised a new, streamlined, and very simple appropriation bill model or, rather, a pattern for an appropriation bill. It is a one-package appropriation bill and is so completely streamlined that it consists of but four pages, and yet, in my opinion, it provides more pertinent fiscal information for the people and for Members of Congress than did the conventional one-package appropriation bill which in 1950 consisted of 482 pages.

Here [exhibiting] it is, Mr. President, as compared with the bill of 1950. Anyone can see what a voluminous document the bill of 1950 is.

My percentage appropriation bill is devised to give the Members of Congress and the man on the street a comprehensive perspective of Federal expenditure that he cannot get by long study of the Federal budget report which ordinarily is three times as large as a Sears, Roebuck catalog; or by reading the customary 20 appropriation bills of 50 pages each; or even the one-package appropriation bill of 482 pages advocated by many Senators.

The percentage approach first determines that \$70,000,000,000, or some other amount, shall be the over-all total of appropriations for the following fiscal year. Every schoolboy knows that a total of anything is 100 percent. Accordingly, my bill splits that total of 100 percent up into many smaller percentages, the sum of which equals 100 percent, and then it allocates these percentages instead of dollars to the various departments and functions of Government. Dividing that 100-percent pie on the basis of the relative importance and proper support for each Federal function is the very essence of the difficult technical job which the Appropriations Committees of Congress are called upon to make.

From long observation, I am convinced that the average Senator and the average American citizen does not make much of a distinction between thousands and millions or even thousands and billions. I have seen the Senate, many times, spend hours debating the virtue of an appropriation for \$100,000 and then without batting an eye vote appropriations of \$50,000,000,000 in a few seconds of time. On the other hand, percentages are different. They deal with the relationship of the support of functions rather than with unrelated amounts of dollars. Very naturally, with respect to such things, there is much understanding and great interest.

Before I can grasp the actual appearance of some new object, I must make

mental comparisons between it and things with which I am familiar. If someone should undertake to describe an elephant to me and I had never before heard of the ponderous symbol of the Republican Party, I might ask: "Is it as large as a donkey? A greyhound? Or even a Greyhound bus?" By making comparisons with things with which I am familiar I could get a fairly accurate picture of a pachyderm.

Almost anyone, in or out of Congress, comprehends when it is said that the Department of Agriculture is allocated but slightly more than 1 percent of the revenues of this Government; or that the Department of the Interior, including Reclamation, gets less than seven-tenths of 1 percent of those revenues, or the legislative branch receives one-tenth of 1 percent, or the District of Columbia receives one one-hundredth of 1 percent, while the military, including civil functions, receives almost 62 percent of the total revenues of the United States. Relativity carries the same vital significances in appropriations as in Einstein's cosmic universe.

Keeping Federal appropriations in the proper adjustment with respect to public functions as a whole on a basis of value to the people is vital to the progress of this great country and its contentment. Balance is vital alike to the circus performer and to a fiscal policy.

The sad state of inflation, with which this country is sorely afflicted has been brought about by blind and reckless fiscal policies with no regard for an over-all balanced budget. The new administration has made a solemn pledge to the American voters to cease indulging in deficit spending. Congress cannot do less than to give the new President full support in his efforts to straighten out the Nation's fiscal problems. It is my earnest and considered opinion that the adoption by Congress of my suggestion for a streamlined appropriation bill with a fixed ceiling for the over-all total appropriation and a fixed ceiling for each departmental appropriation and the opportunity for the Budget Bureau to review and control each executive department's appropriation after it is made as well as before, will be a long and constructive step toward bringing order out of chaos in Federal fiscal matters.

The figures and percentages used in my calculations have been assembled merely to illustrate the new approach to the difficult task of determining the correct size of all Federal appropriations. I do not say that any of them are correct as to amount. I lifted them bodily from last year's appropriation bills and am using them here only to indicate how my plan would operate.

Doubtless, the Appropriations Committees would want to change somewhat every percentage point. I used the over-all total of \$70,000,000,000 because the press had reported that the distinguished majority leader [Mr. TAFT] and President-elect Eisenhower have agreed upon \$70,000,000,000 as a proper total for the fiscal year. My own views are that \$60,000,000,000 would prove to be a far wiser fiscal target. However, that is a matter for the Appropriations Committee members to determine out of their long experience and more intimate

knowledge of Federal fiscal problems. But, I do contend that some over-all specific total must be determined and tenaciously adhered to, come what may, and so I make it a fixture in my bill and build all appropriations around it.

Mr. President, the Seventy-ninth Congress passed Public Law 601, section 138 of which directed the Ways and Means Committee of the House, the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the two Appropriations Committees to meet and to set some figure as the ceiling for appropriations for the fiscal year in which Congress was legislating.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have inserted in the RECORD at this point section 138 of Public Law 601.

There being no objection, section 138 of Public Law 601 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sec. 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

(b) The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: "That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being \$ _____."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the allocation of the exact percentage ceilings to each department and function of government would follow after exhaustive hearings and study by the Appropriations Committees. If one department or function is given more by the committees or by the Congress under my plan some other department or function must receive less. The time-honored custom has been to allocate funds to each function on a basis of the successful salesmanship of the department in convincing Congress of its requirement and then to boost the total to accommodate the increase. Under the old system "log rolling" becomes an art. Under such a system it is small wonder that in this current year we have a deficit of \$10,000,000,000 which, I might add, is a national disgrace. To indulge in deficit spending in the year in which we are enjoying the greatest prosperity of all time, with employment and production at an all-time high, is reckless beyond description. In such a year we are bonding our children's children to

pay for our indulgence, our weakness, and our waste. When honestly analyzed that is exactly what deficit spending means. Here is a truth which cannot be successfully denied. Without the active leadership, enthusiastic support and inflexible determination of the executive, no legislative body can effect economies in government.

I am sure every Member of the Senate who has ever been the Governor of a State will agree with my statement. Legislative bodies simply cannot balance budgets. That is equally true of city councils, State legislatures, and the Congress of the United States.

The founding fathers who wrote our Federal Constitution did not recognize the significance of that fact and accordingly neglected to employ two very vital devices for handling Federal finances. They failed to give the Chief Executive the power to veto separate items in an appropriation bill without vetoing the whole measure, and they failed to make all appropriations by Congress for which no revenues have been provided null and void except in cases of war, insurrection, or rebellion. Colorado, as do many States, has such provisions in its constitution. I believe there are 14 States which make such provision. As a result, there can be no deficit spending in such a State and the governor can keep his State's finances in perfect balance and in orderly adjustment if he has the courage and the will to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a statement by Mr. Paul Hoffman, who, as will be recalled, was at one time president of the Studebaker Corp., and who served as head of the Economic Cooperation Administration, which administered the Marshall plan. Mr. Hoffman has made some very wise observations, and I desire to have them made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What a special group has one year it expects to get the next year. And what one group gets another group wants. At the very least this process has a devitalizing effect on our political life.

There are two effective ways of counteracting long and numerous Government subsidies. One is to insist that they all be openly and clearly defined, so that everybody knows who is getting what and why he is getting it. The second is continually to challenge every subsidy from the general taxpayer's point of view. Those hand-outs that are necessary to the national welfare would, as a result, not only survive but have more general and informed public support. And those which were just habits of past years could be weeded out.

The whole problem of governmental management with its attendant overhead needs unremitting scrutiny.

We need new ground rules, chief among which is legislation enabling the President to veto individual items in appropriation bills, instead of getting the all-or-nothing alternatives that confront him now. In this way the financing of major and necessary programs would not be jeopardized by the inclusion of irrelevant or self-serving riders that get approval only because the President cannot strike them out without vetoing the whole bill.

So long as the armament race continues, a major hope of really living within our means, even with present high taxes, lies in

getting more defense per dollar spent. This was important 3 years ago when we hoped to stabilize military expenses at \$12,000,000,000 a year. It is imperative when we find ourselves spending nearly \$60,000,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Federal Constitution had provided such safeguards for its Treasury I am satisfied the Federal debt would be merely a fraction of its present gigantic size and there would be no undeclared wars.

The percentage appropriation bill virtually gives the President the power to veto items through the Bureau of the Budget's authority, control, and direction to scrutinize congressional appropriations for the executive departments after they are made and before expended by the various executive departments. My bill does not give the President or the Bureau of the Budget any veto or control power over legislative or judicial appropriations. My bill does not encroach on the executive branch nor does it permit the executive to encroach on the judicial or legislative branches.

It should be noted that neither the President nor the Bureau of the Budget can in any way boost an appropriation. An appropriation can be reduced by curtailing expenditures. That is all that can be done. The President cannot shift an appropriation from one function of government to some other function of government. Under my bill that condition remains just as it is at present, under present procedure.

Frankly, greater use should be made of the Bureau of the Budget in dealing with the Federal fiscal problem, and that is an important feature of my bill. It is a large Bureau with many trained and experienced technicians. It has 462 employees, who are paid a total annual salary of \$3,181,000, and an average salary to each of nearly \$7,000 a year. In addition, it is given an annual expense item of \$340,200. I am not being critical of this Bureau, its operation, its size, or its costs. If its costs were three times as great I would not complain, because the Bureau of the Budget should be the watchdog of our Treasury, and good watchdogs cost money.

At present the Bureau of the Budget compiles volumes of vital data on appropriations before they are enacted by Congress, and thereby form a basis for the President's recommendation to Congress. So far so good; but the percentage appropriation bill contemplates that in addition to that necessary service they ride herd on every expenditure of every executive department of the Federal Government after Congress has voted a lump-sum appropriation to such department. If that were done, the President of the United States could protect the Treasury in the expenditure of every penny allocated to a Federal executive department. I have full faith that the President-elect will assume his full responsibility with respect to expenditures if Congress will give him the opportunity to do so.

The Washington Daily News has come up with a very sound, yet very simple, plan for cutting spending. According to the News, here are the ABC's on how their plan would be made effective:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at

this point an article entitled "Here Are the ABC's of How To Cut Spending," published in the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Here are the Washington Daily News' A, B, C's:

A supervisor is a man who bosses other people. Call him a foreman, a straw boss, a sergeant, a corporal. In Government, he's called a supervisor.

In business and industry, he's the one whose performance, in the last analysis, decides whether an operation is efficient or inefficient, whether it turns a profit or runs in the red.

He does well in business and industry. But in the Federal service, he simply never gets a chance. We propose that he get a chance.

We propose two simple (but magic) things:

1. That each Government supervisor be told—in the form of a simple, working budget—exactly how much he spends. At present, astonishing though it seems, most supervisors simply don't know how much they spend.

2. That each and every supervisor then be invited, encouraged, and challenged to make it his personal responsibility to figure out ways of spending less.

Incredible though it may seem to businessmen outside Government, that isn't being done in Government now, either.

Here is what would be done under the News plan that isn't done under the present system:

Once an agency receives its funds from Congress, it would give each and every bureau its own working budget for the year. (This is done now in most agencies—but not in all.)

Once a bureau received its budget, it would give budgets to each of its divisions. (This isn't done now in most agencies.)

Once a division received its budget, it would give budgets to each of its branches. (This isn't done now—except in rare cases.)

Once a branch received its budget, it would give budgets to each of its sections. (This isn't done now.)

Once a section received its budget, it would give budgets to each of its units—if there existed distinct budgets within the section. (This isn't done now.)

And finally, once every supervisor had his own budget—every supervisor of every bureau, division, branch, section, and unit—he would be encouraged, by every means possible, to regard it not as an invitation to spend, but, instead, as a guide to saving.

He would be encouraged to make saving part of his job.

It's as simple as that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This plan does not conflict in any way with my percentage appropriation bill. Rather, it complements it. My plan, as we recall, contemplates a lump sum appropriation to each division of Federal Government. The Washington News plan takes over from there. I think the Bureau of the Budget, representing the Chief Executive as it does, should supervise the News plan and see to it that it is carried out orderly and with positive certainty. No plan can be made self-executing. Every plan must have direction, and that direction in Federal Government, if it comes at all, must come from the President of the United States.

I commend the Washington News most heartily for submitting their timely plan to cut spending and for the splendid articles they have published in support of their vital and realistic approach to

the difficult problem of spending \$80,000,000,000 without waste. Mr. John Cramer, a reporter for many years on the staff of the Washington News, has written eight intensely interesting articles covering the whole field of Federal spending. I ask unanimous consent to have these articles printed in connection with my statement at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. CRAMER'S SIMPLE PLAN

John Cramer has been a reporter on this newspaper for some years. His beat: Your Government.

His daily column is designed primarily to deal with the interests of our readers who are also Government employees.

He doesn't worry about the high-level politics or the kind of news that usually gets the national headlines.

He's concerned about what makes the Government tick for the Government workers—the chores of the administrative employees and the things that affect their jobs.

On this assignment, our Mr. Cramer has learned a lot about government; about its detailed, hum-drum, day-to-day operations.

Like so many of us, he has seen waste, extravagance, and duplication.

Like so many conscientious Government employees, he wondered what can be done when government gets that way.

Possibly because he has seen at first hand and for so long the bafflement of sincere Government workers; possibly because he has been sympathetic to the frustrations of the dedicated public servant, wincing at his job when he hears governmental spend, spend, spend denounced from hell to breakfast. He has been sympathetic because he knows the average Federal employee wants to do a good job, is trying to do a good job, and yet can see for himself the validity of the criticism. The average sincere Federal worker of, perhaps, modest responsibilities, feels frustrated because he can do nothing about it.

He would do something about it if he could.

Mr. Cramer hit on a plan which will give him a chance to do something about it.

Yesterday we told you how the plan generally would work.

In Mr. Cramer's story today you will find specific examples.

Yesterday we described how the identical element that makes a well-run business successful is missing in Government, and we described how it could be added.

This element would counteract the natural tendency to bureaucratic expansion by putting on the Government supervisor the same checks that are put on a manager—no matter how modest his responsibilities are—in business. This element is simply a cost sheet.

In the Government a unit is the smallest segment. Units make a section, and several sections make a branch, branches make up a division, and divisions make up a bureau.

It's an astonishing fact, but true, that in most of this sprawling hierarchy the supervisors of these subdivisions make no budgets. They don't even know how much they spend.

Our idea is simply to give them that responsibility. In other words, to start budget making and money saving at the bottom. As it is now, it mainly is a matter of guesswork at the top.

This change that we propose is general practice in big business.

It has been tried in a few Government units with convincing success.

There's no mystery in it. It isn't revolutionary. It has been done for years wherever businesses have been efficiently run.

All it would take to make it Government-wide policy is an order from the White House.

Several of General Eisenhower's advisers have shown a lively interest in this plan.

Senator FRANK CARLSON, who will head the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the new Congress, thinks it could be the real answer to the economy problem.

However, we don't offer it as a cure-all. It is not a cure-all any more than a good shop foreman is a cure-all for ills which have their roots in some other facet of a business, such as, for instance, its sales policy or its pricing system.

But he can run his shop economically.

He can in Government, too, if he is given the chance.

There are about 100,000 supervisors in our Government. Mr. Cramer estimates that only about 5,000 of them ever have a chance to work against operating costs, and to try to improve their performance records in those terms.

These 100,000 know where the rat holes are. If they are given the job, they will know how to plug them up.

That's all there is to it.

We hope you'll read Mr. Cramer's story today.

We hope the new administration's interest in it will continue to grow, and that steps will be taken to put such a plan into general effect.

Your interest in it will help accomplish this.

AN INCENTIVE PLAN FOR FEDERAL BOSSES

(By John Cramer)

A brand new Government economy idea, first presented by the Washington Daily News in its 9 to 4:30 column on October 27 has attracted the enthusiastic interest of persons close to General Eisenhower.

They are saying it may be Ike's golden opportunity. It may be his chance to deliver on his campaign promise to make the Federal service cost less.

Estimates of the potential savings run to hundreds of millions annually. Perhaps even billions, ultimately.

In a nutshell, the idea is: A working budget for every Government supervisor.

It is a proposal that every Federal agency give every individual supervisor, at every level, his own simple, working budget—and challenge him to cut it.

This is done in most efficient businesses. It is not generally done in Government.

Here is a hair-raising fact—one which can't be repeated too often:

The vast majority of Government supervisors simply don't know how much they spend.

In distilled essence, the News' proposal is simply that Government supervisors be told (for the first time) how much they spend—and invited (for the first time) to work at saving.

Those who have studied the idea are convinced that its possibilities are almost unlimited.

Through it, they say, the entire Federal service would be encouraged to think in new terms—in terms of savings.

A complete new atmosphere would be created—one of governmental economy.

Supervisors at all levels would be put on notice that the business of saving was an important, major part of their jobs.

In the process, they would require a new sense of participation, responsibility, and pride in their work.

And Government as a whole would acquire an important new yardstick of management—the yardstick of continuing dollars-and-cents measurement of efficiency at every level of supervision. It would have:

A yardstick for present operations.

A yardstick for the evaluation of new and improved systems and methods which might be applied in the future.

And a yardstick for the appraisal of the supervisors themselves—an instrument for

identifying the able and weeding out the inefficient.

In the vast majority of Government's sprawling bureaus, there is no such yardstick now.

There is little or no emphasis on economy, as everybody knows.

And most specifically, there is almost no attempt to enlist the aid and ideas of the first-line supervisor in the all-important business of saving. (Definition of a first-line supervisor: One who has no subordinate supervisors under him.)

In one form or another, the budget-for-every-supervisor already is widely used in industry.

Variations of it are in operation in several small units of Government—units, incidentally, which can show amazing but convincing proof of dollars-and-cents efficiency.

The idea would not require legislation. It could be put into effect by Presidential order.

And it's so simple, so inexpensive, that it would not require a single penny of additional appropriation by Congress.

In the military, there's a saying that an army is no better than its sergeants.

SHOCKING FACTS

And the bureaucrats delight to paraphrase this by saying that government is no better than its first-line supervisors.

But where the Army spares no effort to make its sergeants efficient at war, the civilian Federal Government does next to nothing to make its supervisors efficient at saving.

Here are more shocking facts:

Out of an estimated 100,000 supervisors in Government, only about 5,000 ever see anything which even faintly resembles a working budget for the units they manage.

Most of the 5,000 who do have budgets (of a sort) tend to regard them as ceilings on spending, rather than incentives for saving.

And for the remaining 95,000 supervisors, there are no budgets, no emphasis on economy, and little or no encouragement to save.

The News presents the budget-for-every-supervisor proposal in the firm conviction that thousands of Government supervisors know millions of ways in which to economize.

They just haven't been asked.

The News believes that they sincerely want to economize; that they'll do so if given the chance.

SIMPLE BUDGET

It believes that the Federal Government, unhappily, has deprived most of its supervisors of one of the basic satisfactions which comes with doing a good job—the satisfaction of knowing they have done it economically.

A supervisor's budget would be in no way elaborate or costly. It would contain only a few simple lines.

It would show items such as these:

The supervisor's prorated share of his agency's appropriation for normal overhead.

For office supplies.

For equipment.

For office space.

For communications.

For employee salaries.

For travel expenses.

Once given this budget, it would be the supervisor's job to cut it if he could.

We think he would.

Appalling Government waste can be prevented.

It is waste which runs to millions and billions.

This article will cite concrete examples.

It also will show how the waste could have been prevented by a simple, inexpensive plan which the Washington Daily News presented in detail yesterday.

We'd like to call it a magic plan—because it has so many unrealized possibilities for almost-miraculous savings. But it's too easy to be labeled magic.

The waste exists because the 2,500,000-man, \$80,000,000,000-a-year Federal service somehow has lost sight of the simple, fundamental, basic concept that there can be no true economizing—in Government as well as in industry—unless saving is the day-to-day business of every person who has the power to spend.

The waste is fostered by basically able, loyal Government servants—good people, and we really mean it—who spend tax dollars heedlessly, because they've never been asked to heed.

And the waste will continue endlessly, in a trail of increasingly ruinous taxation, unless Government sets out to make saving the main job of those who do the spending.

In Government as in industry, the spenders, obviously, are the bosses, the supervisors, foremen, straw bosses, unit chiefs, and office sergeants—all those who have been raised to places of command, however modest.

The News' proposal for making savers out of spenders is one which always has been standard practice in efficient private industry—yet one which, incredibly, has been lost and forgotten in the maze of government.

The News' proposal is simply this: That every Government agency give every supervisor, at every level, his own simple working budget—and then challenge him, by every possible means, not only to live within it, but, more importantly, to cut it. Let him be rated on his performance.

Under the present system, unfortunately, there is rarely thought of cutting budgets (in the very few places where real working budgets exist) and far too much thought of spending every penny the budget allows.

But let's talk about Government waste.

Let's talk about prime steaks fed to dogs, expensive copper tubing in bundle lots used as reinforcing rods in driveways, about telegrams versus airmail letters, about \$4,000,000, and about a piddling \$400,000.

In a certain small Government agency, a certain division recently discovered that it has \$400,000 more than it possibly can spend.

The budget officer of this agency went to a higher officer and said: "What do you want to do with it?"

Fortunately, for all of us, the higher budget officer had definite ideas. "As far as I'm concerned," he said, "there's only one thing we're going to do with it. Turn it back to the Treasury."

But he knew, and you and I know, and everyone with any knowledge of Government knows that that ordinarily just isn't done. Ordinarily, a way would have been figured out to spend that \$400,000—it happens to be just about 3 percent of the agency's total appropriation.

But let's suppose for a moment.

Let's suppose that every single supervisor in this particular small agency had his own individual budget. Let's suppose that each supervisor knew it to be part of his job to save. Let's suppose that he knew his chances of advancement would depend on how well he saved.

In that case, quite obviously, no budget officer would ever think of trying to find ways to spend an extra \$400,000.

He would know he couldn't even give the money away.

An electric typewriter costs only a few hundred dollars. Nice to have, too.

A section chief asked a division chief for an O. K. to buy one. He said electric typewriters were good for cutting stencils.

The division chief asked a simple question: "How many stencils do we cut a year?"

The section chief said he'd find out, and came back a few hours later to report, rather sheepishly, that the electric typewriter probably wasn't necessary, after all.

It turned out that during the previous year less than a dozen had been cut.

The division chief says: "If that man had been trying to economize . . . if he

had been trying to reduce a personal budget . . . he never in a million years would have suggested buying that particular typewriter."

The information division of a small agency recently began renting a wire service news ticker, delivering the news in much the same way it's delivered to newspapers.

Many agencies have use for such machines. This particular agency has no use for one. Not twice in a year will the ticker carry news so urgent that it really ought to be delivered to agency higher-ups before they can get it from newspapers.

The News suggests that the head of this agency's Information Division ought to have his own personal budget—and thereby be forced to evaluate the real worth of his spending before he orders it.

Here is a simple tale of \$4,000,000.

In the closing days of last June, there was a Navy captain who was slightly frantic. The Government year would close at the end of the month and he had in his unit some unexpended funds—\$4,000,000.

It was the clear understanding of this captain that he was expected by the Navy to spend the money; that otherwise Congress probably would give his unit less next year. And the Navy—God bless it—never gives up.

Though it took some doing, the captain finally made it. Presumably, however, it would have taken a lot more doing had the supervisors under his command—and those above him, too—been bucking for promotions on the basis of what they could save.

This reporter has been told of a not-too-distant house which was built, completely, of material stolen from an Army camp. Of another house which was wired with stolen electric cable. Of a Navy shop where all employees have the almost-unattainable Outstanding Performance ratings—because they know too well the thievery of the foreman. Of junkyard-destined planes which were painted and repainted simply to keep a large crew busy. Of an \$80,000 saving which was accomplished over the strenuous objections of two Government purchasing officials whose only complaint was that a certain purchase would not follow a certain well-loved system. Of expensive brass dumped overboard, in truckload lots, from a nearby Navy establishment simply because it was known that another variety of brass (complete with braid) would soon make an official inspection. Of a nearby military establishment where there is a concrete roadway reinforced with brass tubings—this same in package lots. Of those 200-word telegrams (you've heard about them) which OPS once sent to mayors of all cities of more than 100,000—including four cities which didn't even exist.

For a certain Government photographic unit, Congress made a mistake.

It cut the staff by roughly 80 percent. But it neglected to cut its \$1,000,000 annual appropriation for supplies.

With its reduced staff, the unit had no way to spend the million. But, over the strong protests of its supervisor, it bought \$250,000 worth of supplies every 3 months; kept them for a certain number of days in wangled (and costly) storage space; and then declared them surplus.

This was done to keep Congress from knowing that the unit didn't really need the supplies.

It wouldn't be done if the News plan of making savers out of spenders were adopted.

Wherever this reporter has discussed the News' budget-for-every-supervisor plan with Government officials he has encountered a curious—and perhaps significant—reaction.

The officials suddenly began thinking aloud.

A Cabinet officer was outraged because his subordinates had asked him to make the decision between buying adequate but reasonably economical electronic calculating equipment as against buying twice as costly

equipment which would do more—but nothing more of any real value to his agency. He thought his subordinates should have made the decision themselves. The order was one involving many millions of dollars.

A high-ranking military agency civilian talked of the millions of waste which occur because the military orders X number of dollars spent for X volume of supplies—and then never seriously reexamines to see if the supplies really are needed as much tomorrow as they appeared to be needed yesterday.

A former Government administrator said: "In my agency we really thought we were trying for economy. But, come to think of it, there really wasn't much trying below the Secretary's office."

A Government personnel officer told of the surprising number of recommendations for promotions which were on his desk when he took office. When he told each of his section chiefs exactly how much they had left to spend for the balance of the Government year, most of the recommendations were withdrawn.

In each of these cases, the Government official was convinced that great economies would have been possible had his subordinates been economy-minded—as they would be under the News budget-for-every-supervisor plan.

This is our story about appalling Government waste and how to cut it—about how to make savers out of Federal employee spenders.

It is the story of precisely how we drifted into the incredible situation where most Government supervisors simply do not know how much they spend.

Many have worked at the job of making Government more economical.

Many have wondered why it continues so extravagant.

But almost all have missed one simple, extremely fundamental fact.

It is this:

In the past 20 years, the controls over Government spending gradually have drifted further and further away from the point of spending.

Historically, this was an accident.

There is no evidence it was part of any evil design.

But accident or no, it is a fact.

It has brought us to the point where many Government officials spend heedlessly, blindly, and even contemptuously.

And only when it is recognized and identified in all its terrible implications will we return to a situation in which these officials will know how much they spend—and will work at the business of saving.

The Washington Daily News has proposed a simple, inexpensive plan to reverse the historical trend toward extravagance.

It has proposed that every Government agency give every individual supervisor, at every level, his own simple working budget—and challenge him, by every means possible to cut it.

In essence, this is simply a proposal that the controls on spending (and the incentive to save) be moved back where they always have belonged, which means to the point of spending, which means to the supervisor.

This is so elemental that many will find it incredible that it should even be necessary to suggest it.

Historically, however, two things have happened:

1. As Government mushroomed in the New Deal era, Congress lost much of its former tight control on Government spending. How and why we'll explain in a moment.

2. As congressional controls relaxed, agency controls relaxed, too, but in a different way. And now we're in a mess.

Here's what has happened to congressional controls:

If an agency is small, Congress traditionally votes what amounts to a lump-sum appropriation for the entire agency. If it's a

larger agency, Congress votes appropriations individually for each major bureau of the agency.

This has been the system for years. Unfortunately, it did not change as Government expanded.

In the old days when agencies and bureaus were smaller, the system gave Congress relatively minute controls over spending.

But as the bureaus expanded, this control became increasingly less effective.

Mere sections of bureaus became larger than the bureaus themselves once were.

But Congress continued to appropriate to the bureaus.

And it lost control.

Here's what's happened to agency control of spending:

In the old days, when Congress still was exercising its own control, the agencies were much more alert against extravagance. They had to—because it was fairly easy for Congress to pin-point waste.

In those days, each major agency and bureau had an official known as a chief clerk. He was quite a guy. He was hell-bent on economy.

Tradition says he wore a green eyeshade. When an employee asked for a pencil he got a stub. He was, they say, a very parsimonious gentleman. And because the unit under his control was small, he could make his parsimony effective.

It's different now.

Here's how the spending controls (or lack of controls) work now:

Congress appropriates to a bureau, let's say. The bureaus quite frequently divide up the appropriations among their divisions, telling each the total it may spend. But echelons below the division level almost never are told how much they may spend. They are told merely that they must fire so many employees or hire so many employees; increase their spending for travel or decrease it.

The great mass of Government supervisors are given no individual responsibility for saving.

The unit chief, section chief, branch chief, division chief, and even bureau chief just aren't asked to economize.

In many agencies the only real pressure for economy—the only real pressure to turn back to the Treasury whatever excess funds may have been voted by Congress—comes from the agency budget officer.

And in most cases he is much too far removed from the actual spending to make his pressure really effective.

The controls on spending have moved too far away from the point of spending.

This has led to two widespread, unhealthy, and almost-criminal attitudes which must be reversed if the Federal service ever is to become truly economical again.

One is the attitude that whatever is available is there to be spent.

The other (and far the more vicious attitude) is that economies imposed by Congress must be resisted at all cost—the theory that Congress doesn't quite know what it's doing.

It is this attitude which causes the colonels and generals of the civilian government army to tolerate and even encourage the spending, in the last weeks of the Government year, whatever sums remain unspent up until then.

And it is this attitude, more than any other, which has convinced the majors, captains, lieutenants, and sergeants of Government that saving not only is unadmired—but actually is something a little undesirable.

What a sorry, sorry mess.

The Washington Daily News proposal would change all this.

It would put the dollar sign squarely in front of supervisors at all levels of Government management. It would tell most of them (for the first time) exactly how much they spend—and for what.

And it would invite all of them (for the first time) to make saving part of their jobs.

Only one thing is necessary to make a multi-million-dollar tax-saving success of the Washington Daily News proposal for turning spenders in the Federal service into savers for all of us.

That is common sense.

Common sense to see the simple fact that most Government employees sincerely want to do a good job.

Common sense to understand the present system (in which most Government supervisors simply don't know how much they spend) deprives many Federal employees of the chance to do a good job.

Common sense to provide the leadership which will give them the chance.

The Washington Daily News proposal is a simple, inexpensive, business-tested one.

It is merely that every Government agency give every supervisor, at every level, his own simple working budget—and challenge him, by every means possible, to cut it.

It is merely that supervisors be told (for the first time) how much they spend, and invited (for the first time) to make saving part of their job.

Does that make sense?

It makes sense to the Washington Daily News because we happen to believe in human nature; believe that most Government people are good people; that they really, truly, and sincerely are anxious to do a good, efficient, economical job.

We think it's a shame that so many of them have been deprived of the opportunity.

It doesn't take too much common sense to realize that Federal employees—most of them, at least—do, in fact, want to do a good job.

They are human beings. And history says that human beings always rise, quite magnificently, to their challenges.

But more than that, they are carefully-selected human beings, most of them picked for their jobs through fairly rigid examinations, most of them required to conform to fairly high standards of conduct.

They are, as it happens, the victims of many public misconceptions.

It isn't true, as some would have you believe, that they want to spend, spend, spend. (They simply haven't been asked to save.)

They are not, as a group, lazy, indifferent to the public welfare, or bent (any more than the rest of us) on maintaining their own small empires.

By any reasonable yardsticks, they are above the average run of American human beings.

In its original, October 27, presentation of the budget for every supervisor proposal, the Washington Daily News said it did not believe that Government employees were efficient.

It said they couldn't be—with Government itself putting so little emphasis on efficiency.

But it also said that it believed Government employees had untapped capacity for great efficiency, if properly led.

Now let's talk about human beings.

This reporter remembers listening last June to Bishop Sheen, on TV, when he seemed to be walking to the very end of a limb—and inviting several million irate listeners to saw it off.

He was urging what amounted to a new industrial revolution, saying that workers everywhere must be given a greater voice in management, and a share of profits, too.

And this reporter, somewhat distressed, was saying to himself: "This could boomerang on Uncle Fultie."

But then, as he talked on, the pieces became a pattern.

He said that man's human dignity, as man, demanded that he have much more than a time clock, a machine to tend, and a weekly pay check.

The God-given nature of man, he said, required a job which could enlist not only his hands, but also his brain, his heart, and his enthusiasm. Somehow, he said, we must

restore to daily toil the dignity, the sense of "this is mine" which existed before the industrial revolution.

The Washington Daily News suggests that however much private industry must have lagged in providing worthwhile incentives for its human beings, Government has lagged far more.

Government has given its bosses and office sergeants little or no responsibility for the dollars-and-cents management of its great affairs.

It hasn't even bothered to let most supervisors know how much they spend.

The Washington Daily News simple proposal is that Government supervisors, at all levels, now be given, for the first time, the opportunity to say:

"This is mine * * * my opportunity to make or break * * * by spending or saving."

We don't think it takes too much common sense to see the magic in this.

It takes only a little.

The Washington Daily News' plan for cutting appalling Government waste is not a new plan.

It has been standard practice for years—it's simply taken for granted—in efficient private industry and business.

It works in Government, too. It produces astonishing results—in the very few units where it's been tried.

In fact the only thing really new about the Washington Daily News' plan is the proposal that all of Government return to a practice which industry and business have used all along.

It is a practice which Government itself once used.

But it also is one which Government somehow lost in the vast bureaucratic expansion of the past 20 years.

The Washington Daily News' proposal is simply this:

That every Government agency give every supervisor, at every level, his own simple working budget—and challenge him, by every means possible, to cut it.

In that way the controls on Government spending (and the incentive to save) will be moved back where they've always belonged, which means to the point of spending, which means to the individual supervisor.

This article will cite specific examples of Government agencies where plans very similar to the Washington Daily News' plan already are producing remarkable results.

But first let's talk about how the plan operates in private industry.

Here at the Washington Daily News, for example.

Here at the News, every principal supervisor of every major department has his own working budget.

It tells him how much his department has been allotted for the year—and for what items.

At regular intervals he receives statements telling him how much his department actually has spent—and for what items.

He regards his personal budget seriously. He simply takes it for granted that trying to cut it is part of his job.

He has no disposition—believe me—to spend every cent the budget allows.

If he over spends, in any particular item, he quickly is notified.

If he achieves savings, he's commended. He tries to achieve savings.

And he finds it a little incredible, even as you and I, that such a simple system, so widely used in business and industry, is not used in Government.

To him, it's almost incomprehensible that most Government supervisors simply don't know how much they spend.

One of the really efficient units of Government is Federal Security Agency's 6,000-man Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance in Baltimore.

Where direct comparisons are possible, it has records to prove that its costs compare

very well with those of private industry. (Few Government bureaus can say as much.)

OASI achieves its efficiency by a plan very similar to the Washington Daily News' plan.

In the OASI plan, probable unit costs have been worked out for more than 100 different types of operations.

And the challenge to economy is the challenge to constantly reduce these unit costs.

Were the News' plan of a budget-for-every-supervisor adopted, many agencies undoubtedly would find it desirable to use these budgets as a basis for determining unit costs in many operations.

But in addition, the News' plan goes one step further.

It also would put the spotlight on the particular items of expense (salaries, office space, travel, communications, supplies, and equipment) which goes to make up those costs.

It would spotlight these costs—and make it part of the job of the supervisor to try to reduce them.

For their outstanding efficiency, the 235 employees of Civil Service Commission's Retirement Division recently received cash awards of \$25 each.

This division too, achieves its economies by keeping the dollar sign squarely and constantly in front of the supervisor.

Instead of unit costs, however, it uses time-per-unit, its standard of efficiency measurement.

In other words, its yardstick is: How many minutes and seconds does it require to perform a particular operation?

Unlike the cost-per-unit yardstick, this one remains valid even though a congressionally approved pay raise, for example, increases unit costs.

The Retirement's Division's challenge to economy is the challenge to cut time-per-unit of production.

And its excellent chief, Warren Irons, is one of those who points out that the Washington Daily News' plan effectively could operate side-by-side with the Retirement Division's own plan.

He pointed out that the News' plan would spotlight chances for economy—in office space, supplies, and equipment, for example—which was not spotlighted in the Retirement Division's plan.

The Defense Department is extremely proud of its Military Sea Transport Service.

By the application of business methods of cost accounting—and business-proved incentives to saving—it has reduced its costs to a point where its services cost much less than they would cost if procured from private shipping lines.

How many Government agencies can make a comparable boast?

Here again, however, the approach is the same: MSTs has achieved its economies by putting the dollar sign squarely in front of the supervisor—and keeping it constantly there.

In the current reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, there will be installed a plan identical to that proposed by the Washington Daily News.

We are glad to report that it is not our plan.

Instead, it is the plan of Treasury Personnel Director Jim Hard, a down-to-earth, common-sense Government administrator, who was urging budgets-for-every-supervisor long before the idea occurred to the News.

In the Internal Revenue plan, supervisors will have their own individual budgets.

They will be told how much they spend—by every item of principal expense.

And they will be challenged to work at the business of saving—to make it part of their job.

Is there any other way?

This is a story we'd prefer not to write—one we didn't intend to write.

It's another story about the Washington Daily News plan for turning spenders in the

Federal service into savers for all of us—by making saving part of their jobs.

We'd prefer not to write it for a very particular, and rather personal reason, which is this:

It's always seemed to us that people who present plans (or ideas, if you please) have the bad habit of becoming much too devoted to every single feature of their brain-children.

Overly proud parents, you might say.

Deliver us from that.

We prefer to think of the Washington Daily News plan as an ugly duckling, quite possibly underdeveloped, which others, in time, will make healthy and beautiful.

The Washington Daily News plan is a very simple one.

We have proposed that every Government agency give every individual supervisor, at every level, his own simple working budget—and challenge him to cut it.

That is the Daily News plan.

We think it makes sense. We know it works in business. We're astonished that it isn't used in Government. We're deeply convinced that it, or some simple variation of it, is the only possible approach to real economy in Government.

But—

We also believe that the practical mechanics of putting into effect the Washington Daily News plan should be worked out by others.

We intend to leave it to others.

As it happens, however, a number of people who have been impressed by the simplicity of the Washington Daily News plan have raised a question which, fundamentally, is this:

It looks simple. But is it really simple? Simple in operation?

In this question lies, implicit, the suggestion that Government somehow differs so much from business that business-tested ideas can't possibly work in Government.

Government does differ.

But not that much.

In this story, we'll demonstrate that the business-tested Washington Daily News plan could and would be simple in Government operation.

Although we hope many minds will work at making the Washington Daily News plan a real instrument for Government economy, a few basic principles are all important:

1. The budget-for-every-supervisor proposal should be kept barebones simple. Spare us, please, the red tape artists, who inevitably, will dream up ways of making it complex.

2. It should not be administered by what the military calls staff officers—functionaries with no real authority to command. It should not, for example, be administered by agency budget officers. At best, their command authority is vague and uncertain.

3. It should be administered by what the military calls line officers. In the Government, this means the supervisors, the managers—the bureau chiefs, branch chiefs, section chiefs, and unit chiefs.

4. It should be personally administered by these line officers. It should be made their personal responsibility. They should be given to understand it's part of their job—just as is the business of saving in industry.

Let's talk about one simply way the Washington Daily News plan might be put in operation.

Congress votes funds. Bureau X receives its appropriation.

At this point, we'd propose that the chief of Bureau X give simple working budgets to each of his colonels (division chiefs).

The colonels, in turn, would prepare simple working budgets for the majors; the majors for the captains.

And so on down to the sergeants. They're the important guys.

We ask you to bear in mind here one simple thought: Not too many colonels serve

under any one general. Not too many sergeants are under a lieutenant.

That is important because it points up the fact that the job of budget preparation never could become a large or burdensome chore for any one supervisor in any one chain of command.

What would the budgets contain? How complex would they be?

Initially, they might be as simple as six-line statements, telling the supervisor how much his particular unit had been allotted during a particular year for:

1. Salaries.
2. Travel expense.
3. Office supplies.
4. Equipment.
5. Office space.
6. Communications.

The challenge to economy—the challenge to the supervisor to make saving part of his job—would be the challenge to cut these individual items of expense as much as possible.

It would be the challenge to try to show a saving at the end of the year.

Quite possibly, this idea could be taken one step further.

Instead of being given a budget statement every year, the supervisor might be given a statement every month.

Such a statement would use basically on the same expense items listed above.

But it might present them in a slightly different way.

It might, for example, tell the supervisor:

1. How much he had been allotted for salaries for the entire year.

2. His average allotment for each month (4 weeks) of the year.

3. His actual expenditures for salaries for the preceding 4 weeks.

4. His average expenditure for each 4-week period of the year to date.

Other items of expense—travel, equipment, etc.—would be broken down in the same way.

Is all this really simple?

The answer: Yes, it is.

Bear in mind, again, that there are not too many colonels under a general.

Thus, the burden of preparing even detailed monthly budget statements, such as the one proposed above, would not fall too heavily on any one supervisor.

The real workload (and again it wouldn't be large) would fall on the sergeants and lieutenants—on the first-line supervisor and the supervisor immediately above him.

An appreciation of this is extremely important to any real understanding of the plan which the Washington Daily News proposes.

Here is why the workload would fall on the lieutenants and sergeants.

It would be necessary for the sergeants to keep the lieutenants constantly informed of the expenditures or savings which changed the budget situation of the sergeants.

It would not be necessary for the lieutenants to approve these changes individually any more than they do now.

It would only be necessary that they know about them—and keep a simple record of them.

Let's illustrate by example:

If an office sergeant decided he could get along without filling a vacancy in his unit, and thereby reduce his salary budget, he would notify the lieutenant (or the lieutenant's secretary). And the sergeant's next monthly budget statement would reflect this change.

Whenever he ordered supplies, equipment, travel, or other items of budgeted expense, the sergeant likewise would notify the lieutenant (or the lieutenant's secretary). And these costs would be properly charged to his own individual account.

This would not involve any tremendous bookkeeping or accounting system.

It is very similar to what is being done right here—at the Washington Daily News. It does work in business.

It would work in Government.

In this piece we propose to demolish a myth.

A false and insidious myth about something called the profit motive.

In Government, there are two standard alibis for the extravagance of Government.

One is the alibi that the only way to cut Government costs is to cut Government services. This is a Truman administration favorite.

The other is the alibi that Government can't possibly be as efficient as industry because the profit motive doesn't operate in Government.

Let's talk about the profit motive.

Specifically, let's talk about it in terms of the Washington Daily News' proposal for cutting appalling Government waste by making savers for all of us out of Federal employee spenders.

The News' proposal is simply that every Government agency give each individual supervisor, at every opportunity a simple working budget—and challenge him, by every means possible, to cut it.

And in this article we propose to beat the very daylight out of some popular notions about the profit motive.

It's vastly overrated.

We Americans like to think that the thing which makes American industry so efficient is the profit motive.

This could be one of the great misconceptions of our time.

Take any large industry. A lot of people own it. They are what economists like to call absentee owners. But—and this is important—they are the only ones who get profit.

The real managers of these industries rarely are cut in on the profits. A few at the very top may get specific rewards—perhaps in the form of bonuses—for specific performance. But many other real managers, further down the line, get no specific, cash-on-the-barrelhead reward. None whatever.

So the thing which drives industry—the thing which makes it efficient—isn't really the profit motive.

It's something else.

Take a platoon of combat troops. It can be extremely efficient at a very ugly business which all of its members most assuredly despise.

Obviously it isn't profit motive which makes an infantry platoon efficient.

It's something else.

In our fine country, with its every-lad-is-a-potential-President way of thinking, we've given large freedom to the human being.

It is not merely freedom to do or not to do.

Most importantly, it is freedom for the human being to realize, to the fullest, his great potential.

The Washington Daily News suggests:

The real success of American industry—of any efficient industry—is based not on the profit motive, but, instead, on an accurate, factual appraisal of human beings. It rests upon the simple understanding, which all of us possess, that human beings respond quite well to the challenge to do a better job.

We also suggest that the secret of what is called American efficiency, far from resting on the profit motive, actually rests on methods.

These methods—this great American idea—are methods of tapping the full potential of the human being.

If all this is true, and we think it is true, then the methods of industry will work just as well in government as they work in industry.

One of the methods of industry—one of the ways it achieves efficiency, which means economy, which means saving—is that of keeping the dollar sign squarely before those who do the spending.

It does this by giving them budgets, making them economy-conscious, challenging them to save.

That is what the Washington Daily News proposes (it is all it proposes) for government.

Take a personnel director. Most especially a government personnel director.

He has become, unhappily, a custodian of frustration.

The system which the personnel director is forced to operate (and which, in part, he has created) is one which binds and hampers and confuses and impedes—rather than one which brings forth from the human being his best.

His has become the science of how to move papers, how to maneuver through a particular variety of red tape.

What should his job be?

First of all, it should be not a science—but an art. The personnel director (in government and elsewhere) should be a great artist, playing on human nature like a Kreisler plays a fiddle.

Here is what his role should be:

It should be that of exploring, discovering and developing new ways of tapping (and exploiting, if you please), the potential of the human being—exploiting it to the advantage and profit of management—but also inevitably (and don't miss this) to the greater satisfaction, and greater well-being, and greater sense of well-being of the human beings.

It should be the role of the personnel director to keep the pipes open, and constantly develop new and greater pipes, so that human potential can flow more easily to its destined ends.

That, of course, is not his role now.

The Washington Daily News suggests, as a simple matter of common sense, that government should adopt one method of industry—and begin working a little more hard-headedly to tap the potential of the human being.

One fine day—and oh, what a beautiful morning—the great publicity mills of Government will be grinding out a steady stream of press releases such as:

"John Jones was promoted today from Grade GS-5 to GS-7. In his 16 months as a Grade 5, the unit he supervised reduced its budget by 6 percent."

Or—

"James Smith has retired as chief of Division X—after 13 years of successive reduction in the operating expenses of the division."

On that fine day, all the supervisors of Government (all the Jack Jones and Jim Smiths) will be economizing instead of spending.

Saving will be part of their jobs—just as it always has been for their counterparts in industry and business.

And Government once more will be thrifty instead of extravagant—with millions and perhaps billions in saved tax dollars for all of us.

This fine day needn't be far off.

It can arrive quickly, indeed, if Government merely will adopt one simple, method of business: That of keeping the dollar sign (and the challenge to save) squarely and constantly before its supervisors.

The Washington Daily News has proposed one simple way of doing this.

It has proposed that every Government agency give every supervisor, at every level, his own simple working budget—and challenge him, by every means possible—to cut it.

We have pointed out:

That most Government supervisors simply don't know how much they spend.

That they rarely are invited to work at the job of saving.

That only about 5 percent of all Government supervisors have budgets of any sort.

That even those who do have budgets work under a system which encourages them to

spend its full amount—rather than save what can be saved.

That the system has grown up because, in the last 20 years, the controls on Government spending gradually have drifted farther and farther away from the point of spending.

That, as a result of this drift, most Federal agencies now make the tragic mistake of trying to operate their pressures for economy through staff (advisory) officials. Where the pressures should operate, as any business knows, is thru line officers—those in the direct chain of command.

That this system means, among other things, that most Government supervisors have been deprived of personal responsibility for saving—to their own great loss, and the loss of all of us.

That the system inevitably results in appalling waste. We have cited many examples which could and would be prevented by the Washington Daily News plan.

Our files are full of them. Let's cite just one more.

About a year ago, the News reported how National Production Authority spent \$22,000 for a telegraphic poll of a certain group of manufacturers—a poll which a reputable Washington direct mail firm estimated could have been delivered, airmail, for a mere \$872.

NPA insisted it used telegrams, instead of airmail, on the advice of a high official of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

And the high BLS official was completely astonished that anyone should question the expense.

As delighted as a 12-year-old with his own personal telegraph set, he blandly explained: "Why, it was the best poll I've ever managed."

The News submits that this kind of thinking couldn't possibly exist if all Government officials, including the BLS bigwig, had their own personnel budgets—and knew that their chances of advancement depended, in large part, on how well they saved.

In this series the Washington Daily News also has pointed out some of the specific, concrete things its budget for every supervisor proposal would accomplish:

It would install in Government a system which always has been standard practice in efficient industry and business. There it's simply taken for granted.

It would reverse the trend which has seen controls on spending moving further and further away from the point of spending.

It would put the controls (and the incentive to save) in the place where industry puts them—in the direct chain of command.

It would destroy the all too prevalent and almost criminal idea that every penny which Congress votes is a penny to be spent.

It would create new and continuing yardsticks for Government, yardsticks at every level of supervision, for the evaluation of present operations, for the evaluation of improved methods applied in the future, and for the evaluation of the supervisors themselves. This, we think, has long-range possibilities which fully equal the initial economies the Washington Daily News plan would achieve.

It would create a whole new tone and atmosphere for the Federal service—one of economy.

It would invite the people who know most about how Government money is spent (the supervisors) to work at the business of telling all of us how Government money can be saved.

It would make saving the personal responsibility of the supervisor.

It would give him a greater sense of participation, and through this, greater happiness and greater incentive to advance.

It would make saving part of his job.

WHAT THEY SAY

A former Hoover Commission member: "A wonderfully exciting new idea. I'm surprised it hasn't been presented before. I'm surprised that we on the Hoover Commission didn't think of it."

A Truman Cabinet member: "This could be it—the way to give Government a real substitute for the profit motive."

A Republican Senator: "A great national service . . . the new administration definitely will examine it from all angles."

A civil service commissioner: "The impact on the Federal service would be enormous."

A Navy supervisor-inspector: "Give me my own budget, I'll save 50 percent."

A former Government administrator: "It's completely revolutionary. . . . A really substantial idea . . . I can see the whole Federal service being given a tremendous lift by capitalizing on the interest and effort of the great mass of supervisors."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table of percentages, reduced to dollars.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How the Johnson proposal would work if the percentage of appropriations each agency received for fiscal year 1953 were applied to a 70-billion-dollar appropriation for fiscal year 1954

[70 billion dollars equals 100 percent]

Agency	Percent of total appropriation	Reduced to dollars
Legislative branch.....	0.0960	\$67,200,000
The Judiciary.....	.0340	23,800,000
Independent offices:		
Executive Office of the President.....	0.0090	6,300,000
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	.0010	700,000
Atomic Energy Commission.....	5.1322	3,592,540,000
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	.004732	3,312,000
Civil Service Commission.....	.4260	298,200,000
Commerce—Maritime Activities.....	.2230	156,100,000
Commerce—Civil Aeronautics Administration.....	.178147	124,702,000
Defense Production Administration.....	.0030	2,100,000
Defense Transportation Administration.....	.0020	1,400,000
Economic Stabilization Agency.....	.0740	51,800,000
Federal Communications Commission.....	.0080	5,600,000
Federal Power Commission.....	.0050	3,500,000
Federal Trade Commission.....	.0060	4,200,000
Federal Security Agency.....	2.0507	1,435,490,000
Federal Civil Defense Administration.....	.0535	37,450,000
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	.0100	7,000,000
General Accounting Office.....	.0390	27,300,000
General Services Administration.....	.4910	343,700,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	.1300	91,000,000
Indian Claims Commission.....	.0001	70,000
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	.0137	9,590,000
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.....	.00001	7,000
Motor Carrier Claims Commission.....	.0083	5,810,000
Mutual Security.....	7.4744	5,232,080,000
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	.0825	57,750,000
National Capital Housing Authority.....	.0001	70,000
National Capital Park & Planning Commission.....	.0008	560,000
National Science Foundation.....	.0059	4,130,000
National Labor Relations Board.....	.0012	840,000
National Mediation Board.....	.0014	980,000
Renegotiation Board.....	.0067	4,690,000

How the Johnson proposal would work if the percentage of appropriations each agency received for fiscal year 1953 were applied to a 70-billion-dollar appropriation for fiscal year 1954—Continued

[70 billion dollars equals 100 percent]

Agency	Percent of total appropriation	Reduced to dollars
Independent offices—Con.		
Revolving fund, Defense Production Act.....	.0019	\$1,330,000
Railroad Retirement Board (self-supporting).....	.000	-----
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	.0065	4,550,000
Selective Service.....	.0458	32,060,000
Smithsonian Institution.....	.0048	3,360,000
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	.0004	280,000
Tariff Commission.....	.0024	1,680,000
Small Defense Plants Administration.....	.0047	3,290,000
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	.4185	292,950,000
Tax Court of the United States.....	.0011	770,000
Veterans' Administration.....	4.8164	3,371,480,000
Department of Agriculture.....	1.0438	730,660,000
Department of State.....	.2948	206,360,000
Department of Justice.....	.2296	160,720,000
Department of Commerce.....	.585821	410,074,700
Department of the Interior.....	.6793	475,510,000
Department of Labor.....	.2771	193,970,000
Department of Defense:		
Civil functions.....	3.5931	2,515,170,000
Military functions.....	58.0047	40,603,290,000
Department of the Treasury.....	.8157	570,990,000
Post Office.....	3.4655	2,425,850,000
District of Columbia.....	.0137	9,590,000
Permanent appropriations for general and special accounts:		
Interest on the public debt.....	7.6589	5,361,230,000
Other.....	1.4616	1,023,120,000
Grand total appropriations.....	100.0000	70,000,000,000

NOTICE OF MEETING OF COMMITTEE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that there will be a meeting of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, to be held for the purpose of organization, and to meet the Postmaster General designate, Mr. Arthur E. Summerfield, if he is present.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until Friday, January 16.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 16, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 13, 1953:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

John Carson, of Michigan, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1952. (Reappointment.)

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned captain

Earle A. Dely, effective December 1, 1952.

To be commissioned commander

Joseph E. Waugh, in accordance with law.

To be commissioned lieutenant commanders

Harry D. Reed, Jr., effective December 24, 1952.

Emerson E. Jones, effective December 24, 1952.

Gerald L. Short, effective January 18, 1953.

John O. Phillips, effective January 18, 1953.

To be commissioned lieutenant

Harley D. Nygren, effective March 8, 1953.

To be commissioned lieutenants (junior grade)

William R. Kachel, effective January 1, 1953.

Hal P. Demuth, effective January 5, 1953.

Pentti A. Stark, effective January 18, 1953.

Barbour C. Stokes, Jr., effective January 18, 1953.

Merlyn E. Natto, effective February 25, 1953.

To be commissioned ensigns

Wilfred V. Warner, effective December 9, 1952.

Carlton S. Frost, effective December 16, 1952.

Edwin K. McCaffrey, effective December 17, 1952.

Clifford W. Tupper, effective December 17, 1952.

Richard K. Houlder, effective December 23, 1952.

George E. Cook, effective January 7, 1953.

Howard A. Garcia, effective January 11, 1953.

Lionel D. Kelley, effective February 12, 1953.

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. Edward Mallory Almond, O4666, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Lt. Gen. Lewis Andrew Pick, O8096, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army, retired), for advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast called us to be partakers with Thee in building the Kingdom of God, wilt Thou inspire us with new vistas of outlook and new ventures of faith.

May we daily see the transforming energy of Thy divine spirit remaking our world and lifting all mankind to higher levels of blessedness.

Grant that nothing may ever daunt or discourage us as we strive for peace on earth and good will among men.

To Thy name we ascribe all the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 9, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con Res. 1. Concurrent resolution making the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

THE SPEAKER. The Chair understands there are several Members present this morning who have not taken the oath of office. If they will kindly present themselves in the well of the House the Chair will administer the oath of office.

Mr. COLMER and Mr. FARRINGTON presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE—AMENDMENT OF CLAUSE 4, RULE X

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 68), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That clause 4, rule X, of the rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended to read as follows:

"4. All vacancies in standing committees in the House shall be filled by election by the House."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, first of all I think I should say that I have discussed this with the minority leader; as a matter of fact, we have had it under discussion for several days, and I am authorized to say that the resolution meets with his approval as it does with mine.

Let me explain as briefly as I can what the situation is: I do not need to say to the membership that the numerical division between the majority and minority in this Congress is paper thin, to say the least. Following the usual practice the Speaker, and I as majority leader met with the minority leader and the minority whip to determine the division between the majority and minority on the various committees of the House. We, of course, had before us the over-all membership of the committees as they were starting back after the Reorganization Act before the Eightieth Congress and continuing on through the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses. We determined substantially on the over-all numbers of the committees as they have been through the years. Then, of course, one must also recognize that it is most important and necessary that on all of those committees the majority party have some majority in numbers; however, recognizing the close division in the House, we shaved the division on many of the committees right down to the very edge. One of them I have in mind is 14 to 13, another is 16 to 14. Obviously, if the majority were to give another place to the minority we would no longer be in control of the committees.

After we had made that determination on the over-all size of the committees,

and having regard, I may say, in some instances, to the situation on the minority side where Members have served on committees for a long time and are valuable members of those committees; and having regard for the over-all responsibility and work that needs to be accomplished by the committees, we added up the places on the majority side and that addition came to 237. We have 221 Members on the majority side. The Speaker is not assigned to a committee, and it has been the practice on our side that the majority leader is not assigned to a committee. So, net we have 219 Members to fill 237 places on the majority side.

But here is where our trouble arose. Under the Reorganization Act it is specified that Members, except for four committees that are named, cannot serve on more than one committee. I think we all recognize the intent and the purpose back of that provision. It was felt by a great many people that it would be better for each Member to have one committee and be permitted to devote his full and complete attention to the work of that committee rather than try to serve on many committees as had been the situation before, and sometimes not doing a very good job with any of them.

In presenting this resolution I want to point out that the net effect of it is to remove, at least for this Congress, the rule set forth in the act that requires that a Member serve only on one committee.

Perhaps, I need not explain why we find that necessary. Obviously, if we just assigned our 219 Members there would be vacancies on the Republican side on a number of these committees which would result in the minority party having more Members on the committee than there would be Republican Members and (of course, as I say, that just would not provide the proper situation under which we could function.

As far as I have been able to determine and certainly speaking for myself, the adoption of this resolution to meet this practical situation that confronts us, and which cannot be met in any other way, does not mean that the bars will be let down and that any number of Members will be assigned to more than one committee. It is, therefore, our intent and our purpose and our firm determination to appoint to two committees just enough individual Members on the majority side to permit us to fill these places which have been assigned to the majority on the various committees, and when that is accomplished there shall be no more serving on two committees. In other words, may I emphasize that this course has been adopted as the only reasonable, practical way to handle the situation that confronts us.

It does not in any way represent any retreat or departure from the original purpose and intent of the Reorganization Act. That original intent and purpose shall be and will be followed by us, but this is the way that we have determined we must, for the purpose of this Congress, meet the situation.